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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Methods session, first paragraph: It is better to describe a little more of how the sampling were done: How the 27 venues were selected: Were they all the homeless service centers in London or part of them? How were they selected? Of the 27, how many were hostels, how many were day centers, and how many were drug services? What is the minimum and maximum number of clients recruited from an individual facility?

2. Liability of estimates from a sample size less than 30 or confidence interval half width great than 10 is questionable. We usually not report such estimates. In Table 2, sample sizes for diabetes were 17, for age 65+ was 21. The confidence intervals were very wide. Would suggest suppress the numbers in the table or at least making a footnote for each of them in table and figure.

Minor essential revisions

1. Change “immunization” to “vaccination” throughout the text, as it is more accurate,

2. The title is losing focus. I find this paper is mainly about the influenza vaccination among homeless people, would suggest remove “inverse care”, would suggest change the title to “Eligibility and uptake of influenza vaccination among homeless people for 2011-12 influenza season, London, UK: A cross-sectional survey.

3. For the proportion, I think it does not need to report two decimal, 1 decimal is enough, and it should be consistent throughout the manuscript

4. “2011/12 influenza season” should be 2011-2012 influenza season”, keep it consistent through the manuscript.

5. The first sentence of the 4th paragraph of method session: “by using stata cluster commands” should be put after“… vaccine uptake were adjusted” to avoid confusion.

6. A reference article should be put after the “inverse care law” in the 2nd sentence of the first paragraph of the discussion session

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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