Reviewer's report

Title: Factors Associated with Maintenance of Antibody Responses to Influenza Vaccine in Older, Community-Dwelling Adults

Version: 2 Date: 14 December 2014

Reviewer: Gaëtan Gavazzi

Reviewer's report:

. This is a very good topic with no definitive answer; any work on this field is of importance. The work is well done and add knowledges in the field

Minors essential revisions

A) RESULTS

1) It would be more interesting to provide the data for the whole population in table and not only whose who exhibit seroconversion, or with High Antibody titers.

2) results: the H1 N1 titers are very stonishing, because there is very few seroconversion. It could be important to discuss this point.

3° results: the difference in between sites is of interest and needs further explanation. Did the authors look after problems with the vaccine use in the first site? Can the authors give more explanations?

B) Methods

1) The choice of 250 days (8 months) post-vaccination (S3) is controversial; there is no benefit to keep High antibody titer in july then, it could have been more relevant to measure antibody at month 4, 5 or 6 time of late flu season regarding the date of vaccination.

. If the choice of the S3 is related to know if there is continuous high antibody titers to give an idea of future efficacy of vaccination next year, it would have been of interest to choose the S3 just before the next vaccination time (i.e. 1 year later.)

. This had to be discussed in the paper

2) the population is not very old; this needs to be emphasized regarding good results for some strains of the vaccine.

3) the population is not well defined at functional and nutrition levels; this may change the level of immune capacities to react to a vaccine; it should be discussed by authors.
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