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Reviewer’s report:

The research question posed by the authors is well defined and the methods used to answer the question are appropriate and well described. A few suggestions follow:

• Minor Essential Revisions

1. Methods, pg 5: Would be helpful to know what the “chronic illnesses” were for purposes of generalization of results.

• Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Methods, pg 6: I am concerned about the validity of the two open-ended questions, “Please write freely about things you keep in mind or are careful about regarding your health and how you are feeling” and “Please write any opinions or impressions you have regarding this research survey”, as valid measures of attention to health and interest in research. Just because someone writes a comment would not mean that they are interested in research or pay more attention to their health. How valid are these measures? Perhaps measurement error led to the lack of association in the multivariate model?

2. Methods, pg. 6: What was the distribution or those receiving the baseline questionnaire by mail versus face-to-face?

3. Results, pg 8 and Table 1: What were the diagnoses? The type of diagnoses may be more important in the prediction model than just the number of diagnoses.
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