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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is an important topic with a legitimate aim. However, I am a little bit concerned about the study design and sample size. Selecting health care workers as study subjects is known to introduce at least some bias and decreases the ability to extend the findings to the general population. The interpretation of the results is even more complicated by the fact that some of the subjects received TIV and some did not - if I understand it correctly.

Introduction: The term 'H2N3 seasonal vaccine' must be an error. Similarly, in the Methods section, what is meant by "H1N2 seasonal vaccine’?

Methods: please specify the NCBI website used.

There is no description of how the sample size was determined.

Results: In general, the results section is a mixture of results and discussion. I would recommend removing all explanations and references from the results section and move them to the 'discussion' part, which the manuscript currently does not have.

The part on the potential effect of prior seasonal vaccination is speculative and not supported by the findings - why were the subjects divided into subgroups based on the presence or absence of pre-existing antibodies, and not by previous vaccination status? There were only 14 subjects who did not receive TIV.

The finding that the vaccine failed to meet immunogenicity responses required for licensing is surprising, to say the least.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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