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Reviewer's report:

(1) The question posed by the authors is well described.
(2) There are no further comments on the description of the methods. The authors answered my points (in my first review mentioned in C) sufficiently well.
(3) It seems that the data are sound.
(4) The manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.
(5) There is one comment on “conclusions” (see B)
(6) There are no further comments on the discussion. The authors answered my points (in my first review mentioned in A and C) sufficiently well.
(7) Limitations of the work are clearly stated. There are no further comments on to consider. The authors answered my points (in my first review mentioned in C) sufficiently well.
(8) The authors clearly acknowledge all work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished.
(9) There are no further comments on the title and abstract. The authors answered my points (in my first review mentioned in C) sufficiently well.
(10) The writing is acceptable.

B Minor Essential Revisions (Minor issues not for publication)

(The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.)

• There is one aspects to mention concerning “Conclusions”

To my mind the most important result to comment on is the fact, that patient knowledge doesn’t predict change of driving behavior. But attitudes do. The authors start to mention, that patient knowledge is influenced by age and educational level. It seems that this information is more important than the result that patient knowledge doesn’t predict change of driver behaviour.

• There is one aspect to mention concerning “7. Independent variables
The corrected version is: “The scale to assess frequency of driving was previously used in other studies …

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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