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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 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 re-revised version. We wish to respond to the queries of reviewer:

1. We responded to both reviewers last time and so did not follow the numbering of the present reviewer. However, this time we have responded in the same order as the reviewer’s comments
2. We have used “%” instead of “percent”. We wish to add here that the BioMed Central Website did not accept our abstract with the percentage sign and therefore we needed to spell it out in the abstract.
3. We have added the p-value in the abstract
4. We have added “scheduled for surgery” after “children” in the abstract
5. As much as possible we have added the articles in the manuscript; however we do not mind any minor additions during copy-editing should they be necessary
6. We have added “test the hypothesis that” in page 3
7. We have removed “since” from the second paragraph in page 4
8. We have changed to “initially to fill and removed the “up” from the second paragraph in page 4
9. We have rounded up the percentages to the nearest whole number in the ‘Results’ section
10. We removed the “denomination of the” in page 7 and also changed “majority” to “group”
11. We have used lower case letters for the specialties throughout the manuscript
12. a. We have added “associated with a very high rate of cancellation of 30%”
b. The third sentence of the first paragraph has been moved to the second paragraph after the second sentence
c. We have started the second paragraph with “There are many possible reasons for the high cancellation rate”
d. “Miscellaneous” and “third world” phenomenon have been placed within inverted commas
e. We have re-worded the sentences as suggested
f. We have deleted the entire sentence starting “It is noteworthy”
g. “Influenced” has been replaced for “impacted upon” and “effects” has been replaced for “impacts on many spheres”
h. We have deleted the sub-heading and the paragraph in page 12. However, we are not sure if the reviewer wanted the summary paragraph to be deleted or the previous one with ‘limitations’
13. We have deleted references 8 and 9 as suggested

14. n (%) has been removed from the first column of table 1 and the legend has been relocated below the title of the table

15. Legend has been relocated below the title of the figure 1 (We hope the reviewer mentioned this figure as table.2)

16. Legend has been relocated below the title of the figure 2. We have changed the figure according to the suggestion of the reviewer highlighting the proportion of patients cancelled in each specialty despite attending the preanaesthetic clinic. We have also made the necessary changes with regards to this in the results section.

We sincerely hope that these responses will adequately satisfy the queries raised by the reviewer. 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)