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Reviewer’s report:

General
The paper is generally well written, coherent and well presented. The topic itself is not original and much has been written on it, however majority of published papers are from developed countries. The problems encountered in setting up the preoperative clinics and running them maybe different in the developing countries. Data from such studies would help in sharing and comparing experience from the less affluent countries as well as comparing it to the developed world.

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
I would recommend the following changes
1. The methodology states that the details of cancellation were recorded from each operating room. It is not clear as to what was the source of this information. eg was it the surgeon, or case anaesthetist who provided information regarding reason for cancellation.
2. Table 1 is duplication of information and can be merged with results
3. Table 2: Reasons of cancellation. The information should be presented separately for those who attended the clinic compared to those who did not attend.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. Further details of methodology: How does the routine elective list scheduling take place in the authors institution.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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