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Reviewer's report:

The authors sought to assess perceived disability among patients diagnosed with BPPV in a primary care clinic. They performed a cross-sectional analysis at 2 centers of patients with posterior semicircular canal BPPV, assessing DHI in the short form. The patients were recruited as a sub-study of a randomized controlled trial for the Epley maneuver. The DHI screening score indicating some functional impact of the presence of BPPV and these were higher in women and those with vertigo, but without nystagmus. The paper was well-written, and the study appears to be well-designed, with all the relevant data presented clearly. It can be difficult to distinguish some patients with positional nystagmus/vertigo from vestibular migraine patients and the authors appear to have done a careful job of excluding patients that met these criteria. I have only a few minor edits, but otherwise think the study is worthy of publication.

Line 133 - Use Otolaryngologist rather than 'Ear, Nose and Throat specialist'

Line 106 - Anxiety and dizziness are often linked, and the diagnosis gets complicated with the overlap of Meniere's disease and vestibular migraine. I do not think there is strong causal data suggesting anxiety can trigger Meniere's disease. The paper cited discusses attacks of Meniere's disease in patients who already have the diagnosis.

Line 142 - otolaryngologist rather than 'ENT specialist'

Line 169 - negative DH test

The authors mention this is part of a larger study and the details are uploaded in supplementary information. If all the patients were being treated with betahistine, details on this treatment
should be mentioned in the methods. If betahisine was started after the survey was administered, it is reasonable to exclude this.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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