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Reviewer’s report:

The paper “Influenza immunisation, inverse care and homelessness: cross-sectional service-improvement study of eligibility and uptake” deals with an interesting topics but several constraints should be tackled in order to make it suitable publication.

Major revisions
1. In methods section Authors tell that three investigators did perform the interview. This is a concern: was reliability assessed? How were they trained?
2. I would like to know more about the questionnaire. It would be useful to have it enclosed to the text.
3. Table 1 should be referenced in the text; furthermore, because of missing data, Authors should indicate the number of people with available data for each variable. Moreover, Authors should provide captions.
4. Table 2 is confusing: Authors should pay attention to distinguish between vaccinated people and subjects at risk. Furthermore, some people did contribute to different risk groups. How did the Authors deal with this problem especially when they did release the number and the percentage of vaccinated people? I mean that a vaccinated homeless could contribute to several classes. This is confusing. I would separate people with one and more than one condition at risk in order to have a better idea of their distribution as well as of their vaccination coverage.
5. Since Authors did have access to patients registered to GPs and they used them as denominator in order to calculate percentage of people at risk and vaccinated I suppose that they could include confidence intervals (for national data) both in table 2 and figure 1. Furthermore, they could also apply statistical tests in order to understand if differences were statistically significant.
6. The discussion is quite weak: comparison to international literature is missing.

Minor revisions
7. In the sample size description I would like to see also the estimate of eligible population from which sample size was drawn.
8. It would be interesting to have an idea of people not participating into the study in term of socio-demographic characteristics.
9. In results section it would be nice to have range of age.
10. Authors should pay attention to concordance of number: for example, they did not give all information about the 49 homeless who were vaccinated: for someone, data are missing.
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