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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the possibility to read this interesting and important manuscript. The background explains the background to the study, its aims, a summary of existing knowledge and this study's contribution to the field. The results describe the findings of the study in a clear way. The discussion discusses the implications of the findings and highlights strengths and limitations of the study. The conclusion clearly states the main conclusions and provide an explanation of the importance and relevance of the study reported.

Methods: Did you ask the patients how presented at the clinic consecutively? How you did the sensitivity and specificity analyses are missing.

On page 8 first line where is three … please delete.

Results: On page 14, line 40 you write "the specificity of the KEDS sum score was too low for that purpose" What is this assessment based on? Please give a reference.

Discussion: I think you use the abbreviation ED for the first time on page 16 line 8, please avoid the abbreviation.

Concept: Sometimes you present KEDS as a questionnaire instrument and sometimes as an instrument, I think you help the reader if you are consequent.

Abstract: How the study was performed (sample selection) and statistical tests are missing.

References: This journal uses the Vancouver reference style. In the text numbers in brackets are used. The references are numbered continuously and the reference list is set up in the same order.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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