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Reviewer's report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The author talk about social support and its confused the reader.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The method might need to clarify on page 6. In addition, the authors need more description including psychometrical properties on perceived symptom severity questionnaire.
Need more details in pilot testing and its results.
How many patients and how many partners were recruited should be describe in method.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes, it is.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Nope, pls follow relevant standard especial tables.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The author might need write more about clinical practical suggestions in near future.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The biggest limitation is the data is outdated and collected 9 years ago. Although it was described , but this is a very big weakness that can not be changed.
The data is too old to be published, thus, how to pursued the reader its still relevant.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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?
yes
9. Is the writing acceptable?
yes

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The paper need major revision.