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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)

I was asked to consider the methods of this study. The sampling method is rather unusual (people resting on a bench in front of a church) and will not be expected to reflect the general population in the same age group. However, the paper might still be of interest, in particular as 90% of this sample responded. 

I couldn't help noticing that there are abbreviations in the title and abstract that have not been explained and that the authors give a percentage with two decimals in a sample of only 300, indicating a level of precision that does not exist which can easily be seen if a 95% confidence interval is added. It therefore seems to me that a new round of peer review is needed.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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