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**Reviewer’s report:**

General
The paper addresses an area of interest because of the recent approval of ABPM for reimbursement. However, it is largely an anecdotal paper and were it not for the growing interest in ABPM in the US, it would not be highly recommended for publication.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

2. The questionnaire is biased towards an expected answer. For example, "My doctor clearly explained the benefit..." should simply have been: "Explanation from doctor" and rated on a scale from 1 - 4, with 1 being very adequate and 4 very inadequate, and a similar format should have been applied to the other questions.

3. The quality of ABPM recordings would be of interest - in other words patient satisfaction may have been high but was this reflected in the quality of ABPMs that would influence the decisions the patients assume to be the result of the procedure?

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which
the author can be trusted to correct)

None

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

None

**Advice on publication:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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