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Dear Dr. Jessica Sautter,

March the 18th 2013

Enclosed please find the manuscript, ‘Assessment of vaccine candidates in elderly: a review’. I respectfully resubmit this revised paper to BMC Geriatrics in the hope that the editorial issues raised are correctly addressed. On behalf of all authors, I will provide a point-by-point response.

Editorial issue 1:
‘First, Figure 3 is not cropped closely and includes extra data, presumably used to create the figure.’

*Figure 3 is more closely cropped and the extra data is removed*

Editorial issue 2:

‘Second, the manuscript requires an additional round of editing. In particular, pay attention to language when discussing age. Age is presented inconsistently throughout the text. Use ?X years old? instead of ?aged X years? and use ?X and older? instead of ?X and more.?’

‘Aged x years’ has been replaced with ‘X years old’ and ‘X and more’ has been replaced with ‘X and older’.

Furthermore, the manuscript has again been edited by the native speaker editor called Sally Ebeling.

Response from Sally Ebeling:
‘I have indeed reviewed the manuscript twice in detail, but I am not certain what specific issues need further attention. I am eager to help address any remaining matters of language that may be of concern to assure the best possible outcome for you and the readers of BMC Geriatrics.’

*She is willing to respond to any other concerns regarding the English language by email: SEBELING@PARTNERS.ORG*

We hope that we have responded to your comments sufficiently and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Renske Eilers