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Reviewer’s report:

The authors should be congratulated on the effort they have put in to revise their manuscript, which is substantially improved. I have just the following few comments.

1. The ‘Background’ section is still rather weak and seasonal and pandemic vaccination uptake studies are not distinguished from one another.

2. The authors still need to comment on the fact that the priority groups for vaccination are different for different seasons. Whilst the elderly and students are included at each time, in the pandemic season the authors state that ‘public servants in key positions, teachers and people with chronic disease’ are also included.

3. In the final paragraph of ‘background’ please add in the words ‘associated with uptake of vaccination’ after ‘possible demographic factors’.

4. The participants section is still very unclear to me, can it be further revised?

5. Data collection – authors should say in the paper that their response options were based on evidence in the existing literature.

6. Discussion – it might be worth adding in that the significantly increased uptake of vaccination during the pandemic was not sustained. This would make it clearer when the authors talk about a significant difference in the results but no significant difference (i.e. no sustained increase) over the course of the three seasons, in the discussion.

7. Discussion – the point about response bias in paragraph 4 should be in the limitations paragraph.

8. Discussion – they still haven’t referenced the elderly not being well educated except to say that this is the case ‘in their knowledge’.

9. Discussion, limitations paragraph – rewrite the sentence ‘the different reasons could not be given for each influenza season as the reason for non-vaccination may be different at different times’ in order to make this clearer. They could perhaps write something like ‘Secondly, different reasons could not be given for each influenza season. This is a weakness as it is possible that the reason for non-vaccination may be different at different times’
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