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**Reviewer's report:**

Overall, the article is well-written and the subject should be of interest to the journal’s readership. I have just one Major Compulsory Revision to suggest: in the Abstract and the body of the manuscript, the authors state that "A significant effect of format was found on the HHIE (p< 0.001), with participants reporting higher scores on the online format than in the paper format." However, in the Conclusions section, the authors state that "The overall results from this study indicate that the format of the questionnaires do not affect the results of outcome measures for adult hearing aid users." These contradictory statements probably result from the authors’ decision to use 2-way ANOVA and F statistics to compare results from online vs paper questionnaires. If the authors used any type of simple t-test to compare the online and paper results on the HHIE, there would be no statistically significant difference between these means because of the relatively large standard deviations reported for each HHIE method. I suggest that a different statistical method should be used to compare the results from online and paper questionnaires utilized in this study. Then the authors’ conclusion ("The overall results from this study indicate that the format of the questionnaires do not affect the results of outcome measures for adult hearing aid users") will be supported by comparative statistics for all of the questionnaires, including the HHIE.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.