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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article. However there are some issues i would like addressed, these are mostly in the writing and clarifying of information and i think making these changes would make this article read better
1. in the title you talk of neurogenic claudication, on the questionnaire itself you refer spinal stenosis and in the article you refer to both. This just needs to be looked at and use the same name or names consistently.(minor essential).
2. Background..your aim to explore current patterns of patient assessment...would it be better to say clinical recognition from the assessment. Its just your statement seems to make me think of the assessment process and not the clinical reasoing/findings attached (minor essential).
3. Interface/CATS explain all abbreviations the first time you use them.(minor essential).
4. Procedure - this is difficult to follow and needs to be re written...why was it an audit...do we need to know this, is it an audit or a survey? You dont need to lead on to the purpose behind this..ie to repeat the survey later which i found hard to follow. This would be better at end of article when you recommend further research. (Minor essential)
5. Data analysis please add in here how you dealt with reponses to open questions.
6. Either use numbers or % or both consistently in text and in tables.(minor essential).
7. Regognition and diagnosis of neurogenic claudication/ management...this section is fine as a whole but it would be better not to start a paragraph with Table 2. The 3rd paragraph reads better and model the others on this one.(minor essential).
8. some repetitiveness in discussion ...3rd paragrah ties in more with the 5th paragraph. Also clarify 'one explanation of this..didnt quite understand that.(minor essential).
9. Just be cautious with your opening statement in the conclusion..it would suggest that it is a clinical syndrome because we recognise it....which we cannot say.
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