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Dear Sir,

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to submit a re-revised version of our paper MS: 1914548542734645 "Trends in influenza vaccination coverage in Portugal from 1998 to 2010".

Bellow you will find our detailed responses to the reviewers and editors’ comments. We thank you for providing helpful comments and suggestions that helped clarify and improve the quality of the paper.

Sincerely,

Cátilia Sousa Pinto

Answers to Reviewers:

**Reviewer: Carlos Chiatti**

**MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISION**

1. “The title does not convey the contents of the paper, as it does not suggest the fact that the paper analyses also the impact of pandemic threats on IV coverage”

   We agree with the suggestion and changed the title accordingly.

2. “The research question posed is well defined, however, the methods should be written in a more detailed manner, especially how the trend in IV was tested and what kind of post-estimation analysis has been made.”

   The linear time trend was measured and tested by including in the meta-regression model a time sequence variable, sequence number from 1 to 12. The linear time trend significance was evaluated by the null hypothesis of the trend regression parameter being equal to zero by the Z test, so the time trend was not evaluated in a post-estimation procedure of the regression model. This information was clarified in the methods section.

3. “I suggest the authors to rename the paragraph at pg. 18, currently named "The survey" as "limitation of the study".

   We agree and renamed the paragraph accordingly.

4. “The manuscript generally adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition, however, more information on the data are required (it is not sufficient the
reference to the methodological report which is written in Portuguese), as well on the methodology used.”

We clarified the methodology used in the methods section.

5. “Too much of the results are actually presented in the discussion section. The authors are presenting too many results data in the discussion instead of debating about the findings of their analysis. I suggest moving to the results section this type of sentences.”

We reviewed the discussion and removed the issues that were mainly results, maintaining only sentences that provide our interpretation of the study findings.

6. “Too many headings and subheadings. The paper is composed mainly by many short sub-paragraphs. This makes it difficult to read.”

We reviewed the headings and subheadings of the Discussion so that it becomes more comprehensive and easy to read.

7. Table 3 please explain what the p-values are actually testing.

We added a note in the table (now table 5) to clarify that p-value test the significance of regression coefficients.

8. “Tables and Supplementary materials. The paper is confusing as far as the tables and the supplementary materials are concerned.”

According to all suggestions made and to overcome this issue we included all tables sequentially in the text of the main manuscript. We think that this addresses all concerns and helps to clarify the manuscript.