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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".

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

Sincerely,

Cátia Sousa Pinto

Answers to editors’ comments:

1. “The Supplementary table files seem all mixed up.”

We do not know why the files were mixed. We resubmitted the table and figure files (5 tables and 2 figures) named according to the text.

2. “Table 2. The ECOS Sample column is confusing. Maybe use the column heading Year ECOS sample formed”

We changed the column heading accordingly.

3. “Table 4. The rows need labels for sample size, %. and 95% CI. For the tables, footnotes need to explain the abbreviations for CI. All column headings should be bold. Please carefully check the tables before resubmitting. There are some bolded values in the Results section of the manuscript that shouldn’t be bolded.”

We reviewed all the tables and results section accordingly.

4. “After reading through your manuscript, we feel that the quality of written English needs to be improved before the manuscript can be considered further. We advise you to seek the assistance of a fluent English speaking colleague, or to have a professional editing service correct your language.”

We improved the written English by using the professional editing service suggested by biomedcentral to correct the language.