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Reviewer's report:

General

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Review of Ernst and Bergus “Patient satisfaction…”

1. New question which is well defined and relevant
2. Methods clearly described. The Questionaire used can be provided, if the authors choose to do so.
3. Data are apparently sound and reasonable. No major surprises or reservations on my part.
4. Relevant standards appear to be met.
5. Discussion is generally fair minded and balanced. I have a few suggestions.
6. The title is a neutral one and might be re-written as a more positive statement. Abstract is accurate, but should include the need for patient education, as is given in the conclusion of the text.
7. Writing is clear and somewhat wordy and conversational. More concision is suggested.

Comment: This survey of patient satisfaction with ABPM is a new finding that may be helpful for physicians considering the use of this test. I recommend publication with a few minor revisions.

Minor revisions suggested

Include in the introduction, the statement that, ABPM when available, appears to be well accepted by physicians (1).

Page 11, discussion re reference #17 should be somewhat expanded. Little et al. found that patients accepted home blood pressure monitoring as the better alternative. However, home pressures have limitations, 1) lack of sleep recording which may have value for prognosis (2), and 2) questionable accuracy if not made with recording devices, as patients may not record their own pressures faithfully (3).

Reference List

(2) Verdecchia P, Porcellati C, Schillaci G et al. Ambulatory blood pressure: an independent

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Advice on publication: Accept after discretionary revisions
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