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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The manuscript is well written and well organised, the methods and variables have been motivated for while ethics issues were addressed. My comments are as follows:

POINTS TO ADDRESS:

1. In the absence of embedded page numbers in the submitted document, on Page 7 (of the PDF document counter): The sentence in Lines 16-19 should be in past tense and not present tense.

2. On page 7, Lines 51-54: The authors should provide an interpretation i.e. indicate the limit (or cut off point) for the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient test values supplied.

3. On Page 10 under Data Analysis: The authors indicated that there were 'baseline' variables? Please explain where did the baseline data come from in the cross-sectional study and where did the data go in the Results?

4. On Page 11, Lines 41-48 under the Results section: What were the limits and/or literature references for 'HIGH or LOW knowledge level of pneumonia'; 'HIGH or LOW level of pneumococcal vaccination'? There is no pre-defined criteria described in the method on what basis and how the different variables can be scaled as HIGH or LOW e.g. is a score of 50% or more regarded as HIGH for all score-bearing variables?

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.

Unable to assess

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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