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Reviewer’s report:

General
A useful exercise but implications of findings limited by sampling bias.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1] Data too weak to substantiate conclusions regarding socio-economic implications. For example (see table 3) 22% of 50 subjects living in deprived neighbourhood is 11 and 11% of 28 is 3, which numbers are too small to permit conclusions as stated.
2] Gender distribution of 844 subjects should be included. 85% vaccine uptake in males and 75% in females are high figures and as you point already indicate sampling bias. A sampled population of persons over 74 years (random by gender) might be expected to include about 40% males.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1] Flu in 1989 was the worst in the last 20 years. It should not be described as minor.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1] Because the sample is biassed I do not think you can legitimately describe this as a baseline study for further work though it can legitimately be described as a methodological pilot.

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: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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