General
This study describes predictors of pneumococcal vaccination among elderly patients with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP). The study population includes 185 Canadian community-dwelling individuals aged >= 65 years with clinically diagnosed CAP and data was collected from a telephone survey. It reports that the significant predictors for pneumococcal vaccination were: “receipt of influenza vaccination in past year”, “being 70 years of age or older”, “presence of one or more co-morbidities”, “presence of health problems limiting physical activities”, “presence of little or no bodily pain”, and “having spiritual values or religious faith”.

The study represents a contribution to its field, and data can be interesting for those involved with immunizations and care of the elderly.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1.- Abstract (third line): I suggest change “prevalent” for “incident”

2.- Discussion: Similarly with this study, a classical study by Zimmerman et al also found a strong association between receipt influenza and pneumococcal vaccination in elderly persons. I suggest that this concern could be commented in the Discussion and referenced (Zimmerman RK, Santibanez TA, Fine MA, et al. Barriers and facilitators of pneumococcal vaccination among the elderly. Vaccine
2003;2001:1510-17).

3.- References: The references are quite good. However, the writing name of the journals should be revised because some are written as abbreviated name whereas other journals are written as complete name. I suggest that reference 12 (Dear et al, Cochrane review 2003) and reference 15 (Moberley et al, Cochrane review 2008) could be unified in only one reference (the second basically is an update of the first)

4.- Tables: 
I suggest to introduce the term “univariate analysis” in the title of Table 1. I believe that Table 1 is too long and it could be summarized.
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