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To
BioMed Central Editorial

Ref: MS: 3102722469315773 - Evaluation of the utilization of the preanaesthetic clinics in a University Teaching Hospital

Dear Madam/Sir,

Many thanks for reviewing the above article and providing valuable suggestions. We have revised the article, and accordingly incorporated all the suggestions of the reviewers in the present revised version. We wish to address the criticisms of reviewers:

1. We changed the format of the article and copy-edited this version with the help of native English speaking colleague.
2. We have attempted to correct the grammatical errors and style, and we have chosen to follow the British spellings uniformly.
3. We wish to state that the abstract was submitted earlier and was uploaded in a separate section. However, presently, we have included the abstract into the text.
4. We never had the intention of saying that the purpose of preoperative assessment is to decide about a particular type of anaesthetic procedure. In fact later in the ‘introduction’ section we mentioned that this assessment is useful for optimization of the patient. We have changed the sentences which would have had such a connotation in the ‘introduction’ section. We completely agree that assessment in the clinic does not preclude another preoperative visit by an anaesthetist.
5. The “Hospital Setting” section has been moved to the ‘methods’ section.
6. We had earlier mentioned that we arrived at a figure of 30% cancellations during the pilot study, which we used to calculate the sample size. We have deleted the details of calculation. We agree that an observational study may not strictly need sample size calculation, but the sample size was calculated to determine the minimum duration of study period.
7. Since we have separate clinics for children and adults, we decided to study them and report separately. We have mentioned this in the text.
8. Discussion section has been reorganized in accordance with the reviewer’s suggestion. We have discussed the cancellation rates comparing this with other studies. The reasons for cancellations have been compared between the patients who attended and did not attend the clinic. The table has been changed accordingly.
9. The information regarding cancellations was recorded prospectively in each operating room on a daily basis and this has been included in the ‘methods’ section. Only on the basis of this information we discussed the various problems relating to cancellations such as deficiencies in operating room management. The miscellaneous causes have been included in the discussion as suggested by the reviewer.
10. Table 1 has been deleted and Table 2 has been modified
11. Legends have been added to figures
We sincerely hope that these responses will adequately satisfy the queries raised by the reviewers. We request that the revised version may kindly be assessed and considered for publication. 
Thanking you again for your valuable comments,
Yours truly,

(S. Hariharan)