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Reviewer's report:

No major compulsory recommendations but a minor recommendation to say more on the sample size chosen.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes and clearly stated at the end of the introduction

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes

3. Are the data sound?
Yes

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
Yes

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, the sources of error in table 4 are particularly useful and potentially generalisable.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, though the study was powered to provide a margin of error of less than 10% for the estimate of prevalence and this is rather a wide margin. The estimate proved incorrect in the case of COPD where the margin was -12 to +14% and the kappa for this of 0.44 is rather low.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes
10. Is the writing acceptable?
Good in fact.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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