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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This is an article reporting the participation and representativeness of pregnant women in a nationwide web-based surveillance system for influenza-like illness among French pregnant women. Its aims and background information are clear. However, the structure of the methods, results and discussion sections is somehow confusion.

Specific comments

1) Please give examples of influenza-like illness symptoms as this would be helpful to readers unfamiliar with this condition. These could be included within the section on data collection (page 4).

2) Recruitment of participants on page 5: please add more detail regarding selection of the 10 maternity centres out of the 145 largest centres in France for the display of advertising poster. For example mention the sampling procedure followed.

3) Are the subheadings immediately below the statistical analyses (i.e. representativeness and participation) part of the statistical analysis section or not? If yes, they don't quite fit nicely. If no, then I would suggest these sections be rephrased and placed before the statistical analysis section to allow a smooth read.
4) Which statistical analysis software package was used (SAS, STATA…)?

5) Page 7 line 154, could the authors please restate the study period to remind the reader the period it took to enroll 153 participants into this study?

6) Could the authors please clarify the model building strategy followed to determine predictors for active participation? It seems only three variables (education level, occupation and previous GrippeNet.fr participation) were included in the multivariable model.

7) The authors mention retention rate in the abstract and study strengths but do not explain how this was measured. Or is it used interchangeably with participation rate? If so, why?

8) The structure in which the results are presented and discussed is confusing. The authors might find it helpful to separate the results and discussion sections. A summary of main results main be placed in the first paragraph of the discussion section, followed by study strengths and limitations and then the discussion of study results in light of other comparable existing evidence.

9) The subsection on study strengths and limitations needs more detail. Such detail appears in other subsections e.g. in the first paragraph of interpretation of study findings.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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