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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript addresses an interesting topic. The small sample size for this study, was it statistically large enough to be able to establish associations and relationships? What was the statistical rational to this sample number? Was any standard error considered? Clarify.

Why was the CRP centre only considered? Is it the only available centre in Bangladesh where such disability is present? Clarify

These actual sample size under study is not clear; the 117 patients were out of the 199 consented? Then what about the 211 patients? At the end it was stated that a total of 316 patients were considered, which I am guessing was the 119 + 117. Kindly clarify further, it is confusing.

How were the 42 non-disabled people selected? Any criteria? Were they related to the patients? Clarify

Also note that these is a mistake in Table 5, where n=357 when in fact it should read n=358.

The interviewers that asked the questionnaires, where they trained? where they medically oriented? Kindly give more information.

The discussion section consists of recollection of results! Discussion should contain explanation of the results and not results statements. The discussion should also contain comparisons to other studies. Why was the study only compared to Chile? Is Chile socio-economically comparable to Bangladesh?
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