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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author/s

I have read with much interest the research paper on: "Factors associated with pneumococcal vaccination in elderly people: a cross-sectional study among elderly club members", for the BMCPH to which I would like to make the following remarks:

The authors address an interesting topic, such as vaccination against pneumococcus in a population over 65 years of age.

The title should indicate the place where the study has been carried out (Japan), it should be more concise.

The abstract is correct and collects the content of the manuscript well.

Background: The status of the meningococcal vaccination in Japan is well described and in the end the objective of the study is made explicit: "to investigate factors associated with pneumococcal vaccination among people aged 65 years or older in Japan".

Methods: setting and participants and procedure well explained. The questionnaire is well described, it is very interesting and quite infrequent to use a model such as PRECEDE-PROCEED by Green and Kreuter (which deserve to be cited) combined with the HBM (for the case of PRECEDE predisposing factors). "Green LW, Kreuter MW.(1999). Health promotion planning: and educational and ecological approach.3rd ed. London : Mayfield publishing," for example or another edition.

The analysis of the data and the obtaining of the sample are correct.

Results: the outline of the presentation of results is simple and understandable, follows an appropriate order and is well supported by tables and additional files.
Discussion: well structured, highlights the three most significant variables of the study associated with pneumococcal vaccination: having received a recommendation for vaccination from medical personnel (OR: 8.42), having received influenza vaccination in any of the previous three seasons (OR: 3.94), and perceived severity of pneumonia (OR: 1.23).

They describe the limitations of the study and state in the conclusions that "this study could be useful for further vaccination strategies, to increase the vaccine coverage in the elderly population".

Conclusions: This is the weakest part of the manuscript, it reveals how studies are made that later do not have a practical application, concluding with a declaration of good intentions. In this study the conclusion is far from the theoretical framework that has been established, where only part of the steps of the PRE-PROCEED has been applied, a model aimed at planning behavioral or educational activities for action. What will be done with the results? Are you going to start an intervention program? Will the results and conclusions be communicated to the health authorities that make decisions? What will change in the pneumococcal vaccination of the elderly in the city where the study was conducted or in Japan?

Tables and additional files are correct.
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