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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

As can be seen by my answers to the questions posed the article is for the most part acceptable.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

The authors make the mistake of equating lack of statistical significant difference with proof of no difference. In all of the instances where there is no statistically significant difference they must conclude that no difference was detectable in this setting. This will require rewriting the conclusions, discussion and abstract to reflect that. For example in the abstract "measurements using a BpTRU machine in a quiet room, which accurately reflects the day-time mean of 24 hour ambulatory blood pressure monitoring" This statement is an inappropriate interpretation of the data.
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