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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have made a number of changes which I feel has improved and clarified the manuscript for the reader. Some outstanding points from my original review not yet addressed are presented below.

Minor Essential Revisions

I think the restructuring of the background and addition of references to support statements relating to pharmacies safely providing vaccinations has improved the manuscript. However, I still feel the background would benefit from/it would help the reader if references were provided to: published vaccination targets; the statement ‘The uptake of NHS-commissioned flu vaccinations in community pharmacies in England has increased significantly in recent years’.

I think it would still be helpful to provide a bit more information about how/why the 13 pharmacies were chosen and how representative or not they may be. Were all pharmacies ranked in terms of the number of vaccinations they provided (the previous year?) and then the top 13 chosen? Were they from across the country? Was the number 13 chosen for a particular reason?

In relation to the number of people aged 65+ I think it would be helpful for the reader for you to explain the reason for the n=50 in the text and n=48 in Table 2 (perhaps as a footnote?) as you have done in the response to my question.

The addition of row totals to tables is useful. I still think it would be helpful if: the Table 1 title included reference to the fact these data relate to the 100 people who recalled being contacted by their GP about vaccination, but chose to go to the pharmacy; and if the number of times (in brackets) each ‘other’ reason was given was provided in the footnote.

Minor issues not for publication

Results para 2: superscript th for 16th March, for consistency with other date presentation

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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