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This study compares four parental questionnaires with the findings of subsequent sleep laboratory testing in children to find a clinically practicable test to identify OSA in children. They report that a 3-question test alone facilitates the detection of pediatric OSA. It is important to have an easy, practical and brief screening tool for OSA in paediatrics. The difference between the OSAsq3 and the OSAsq3/8 appears to be assigning a fraction vs. a simple sum-score.

One of the major limitations of this study is that they tested children who were already suspected to have OSA, since these children were already referred for sleep lab testing. Therefore in order to determine the true sensitivity and specificity of the tests for use as a screening tool, the authors' findings must be validated in patients who are not already suspected to have OSA. The reasons for referral to the sleep lab should be included. Other demographic information such as BMI should be reported. The rationale for selection of the 3 questions in the OSAsq3 should be provided. As well the number of children is small. The authors should justify the sample size of 53 children. The mean age of the children is very young and these results may not apply to older aged children. The conclusion in the abstract and manuscript should be rewritten to reflect the limitations.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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