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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is a clear well written report of a well designed study. Well done. This is a useful topic as the tools available for screening different patient groups in hospital is not defined and a range of tools are used. Many of which do not have adequate reliability data. thus, this contributes to the body of knowledge.

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Please include the sensitivity and specificity data in the introduction. This is important for people to decide whether to use the tool or not.

Please reference your supplementary data and explain what it is and link it to your paper in some way - I did not spot a reference to it.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

You need to be clearer about the sample size – you decided for good reasons to use a small sample size and justified this in your methods. Then you raise small sample size as a weakness – if it is a weakness why did you not use your full sample of 56 patients. This is confusing. What readers want to know is whether this data is robust – on one hand you say it is, then you say it isn’t. Take a definitive line and that will help readers with less knowledge of reliability study design decide whether to use this tool confidently.

no other changes required

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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