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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
Nil

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract Background - Suggest changing to: Metabolic syndrome (MetS) is a major public health challenge. General practitioners (GPs) could play a key role in its recognition. However, it often remains undiagnosed in primary care.
2. Add: Abstract Study Purpose - To assess how well GPs and patients recognise MetS.
3. Abstract Methods - Suggest rewording to: 26 health centres around Finland were randomly selected to identify, over a two week period in April 2005, patients meeting the inclusion criteria of coronary heart disease or one of its risk factors. GPs and identified patients were asked to complete surveys which included a question about the patient's MetS status. A trained nurse conducted health checks of the identified patients utilising criteria for MetS modified from the National Cholesterol Program. Data from the GPs' survey were compared with those from the health check to establish the extent of congruence of identification of MetS.
4. Abstract results - suggest rewording to: Almost half (49.4%) of the patients met the criteria for MetS as established by objective measures. However, from the GPs' survey responses, only 28.5% of patients were identified as having MetS. Additionally, these groups of MetS patients were not congruent. The sensitivity of GPs' ... 0.73. Of the study patients, only 7.1% stated they were suffering from MetS.
5. Abstract conclusion - suggest rewording to: Most patients are not aware of having MetS.
6. p4 Under participants - "Altogether 181 GPs collected the data..." needs some explanation of the type of data collected and from where it was collected.
7. p5 What data were elicited from the patient questionnaire apart from the one mentioned in the abstract?
8. p5 should be ...fitting the patient's upper...
9. As previously mentioned, need some explanation of what other questions were asked in the patient and GP questionnaires and why the data were not included in this paper.

10. p7 under Results - states that measurements and records were collected from 1160 patients but this does not match the data provided in Table 2 eg n=1132 for BP measurement - why didn't the other 28 patients have their BP recorded? Why did 9 patients not have their gender recorded (table indicates n=1151? There needs to be an explanation of why 'n' differs so markedly between criteria.

11. p8 Under Discussion - "Much work...underused." Suggest changing 'underused' to 'unrecognised' or 'undiagnosed'. "On the other hand...to the patients." Suggest changing 'concept' to 'condition'.

12. p8 2nd paragraph under Discussion - "However, we think...share the responsibility." Suggest wording this more positively eg However, there may be valid reasons for this, for example, over the years...

13. p9 "There might be... concept of MetS". Not sure that "using the concept" is the right term but perhaps it should be "not using the diagnosis of MetS".

14. p10 under Conclusions - should be '...patients were not aware...". Full stop after last sentence in this paragraph.

15. p10 under Competing interests - should be "There are no competing interests..."

16. Table 2 - 2nd criteria >65 years add (%)

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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