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Reviewer’s report:

I enjoyed reading this interesting, well written manuscript, however I feel the methods section could be improved by adding some information as detailed below, some of which I consider essential (items 1 & 2):

1. Line 7-8: The name of the institution that granted ethical approval, along with the ethics reference number should be included

2. Line 23: Study period and the setting (hospital name) should be included

3. Table 1: Age range of respondents given in this table suggests the study included children, however it is not clear how many children (under 16s) were included (would be helpful to know) and whether children completed the same questionnaire administered to the adults or a child version. Recent reports emphasize the importance of having tools suitable for completion by children (e.g. there’s a PREM tool specifically for use by paediatric patients in all urgent and emergency care settings, although this is not specific to emergency abdominal surgery http://www.rcpch.ac.uk/child-health/standards-care/quality-improvement-and-clinical-audit/patient-reported-experience-measu

4. In the analysis did you consider adjusting for any confounders? (e.g. age, given there's a wide age range amongst respondents?)

5. Figure 1 flow diagram and the main text give the number of eligible patients as 97, but Fig 1 legend reports 98 eligible patients, which I suspect is a typo.

6. In Figure 1, it might be more accurate to say "87 patients were targeted for recruitment". Currently, there's contradiction in the flow diagram as it says "87 patients contacted" followed by "15 unable to contact"...

7. I would’ve expected to see standard deviation represented with "±" preceding the number, it currently is not

8. p-values are given to different decimal points (varying between 2 and 3 dp, the latter being used in a few places where there's borderline significance). It would be better to present p-values in 3dp throughout for consistency.
9. Reference 3. It would be helpful to provide the URL to help find it:

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

No

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.
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