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Reviewer's report:

General
The article give a good idea on the reasons of over 74 olds for getting a flu shot. Although the data are somewhat out-dated (in what year was the survey actually?), the results give understanding on the possibilities for interventions. In the background paragraphs is is not made clear what the actual question is (‘Such information was collected…’). The authors say they examined associations between patients’ reasons... and their socioeconomic background, but they only do that for two variables. Their statistics are not very sofisticated.
For an international readership the choice of subjects is not very clear (MRC Trial of assessment??; universal assesment??)
What response in the universal arm was 78%? Which 34 of ‘these 53 practices’ took part?
Although the authors describe a two fase self-weighted sample, they do not report on the results per practice and how they corrected ('svy suit of commands in Stata' is not cleat to me)
The sample size calculation turns up with a number which seems enough, but the reasons are rather subjective ('This was inflated by four’ and ‘doubled')
There is a difference between the percentage that stated that they has influenza vaccination and the GP records. It is not vclrer to me what the authors used as gold standard.
Table 3 is rather disappointing: two reasons are singled out and presented in a four by four table with (seemingly) random variables. Is it possible to present the data in a multilevel logistical regression analysis?

In the discussion the authors have to suggestions on what the results might mean. In my opinion the question to begin with was not clear and the analysis of the results too easy to draow any copnclsion.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
as stated above

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes
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