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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Most of the suggestions for improvement have been dealt with, although language editing is needed. A paragraph on Strength and Limitations of the study is added after the conclusion. It should be moved before the conclusion. The discussion of limitations is not adequate; there are several sources of bias in this study that have not been discussed.

- For example, it is said that 24 laboratories were selected, and that the "first 12 patients were interviewed from each visited laboratory". Is this a pure random method of selection or could there be biases associated with this method? The paper says that 295 patients responded to the questionnaire. But 24 labs x 12 interviews = 288. Please explain the inconsistency. More details need to be provided on the selection of patients, and reservations should be taken when conclusions are drawn.

- The response letter states that the response rate was 100 % This is unusual, but if correct it should be stated in the paper.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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