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Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. As the questionnaire was given to everyone who visited the clinic, the authors, by their own admission, cannot determine the number of unique respondents. Thus, the results are potentially biased by multiple responses from the same respondent.

2. The authors have not accurately referenced the Churchill et al. article. The authors refer to it as Anand et al. The Churchill et al. article is a significantly larger study (N=1028 with a response rate of 71%, 555 of were included in the final analysis) preceding the current author's work. The current work is merely replicates the Churchill et al. work (using a small N) in cardiac and respiratory clinics as opposed to ophthalmic clinics. It is unclear what this paper adds to the literature.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

None

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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