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Reviewer's report:

Thank-you for asking me to review this paper on an interesting topic

Major Compulsory Revisions

BACKGROUND

This section is very limited and needs to be significantly expanded reviewing the evidence to date on this topic, what if any related reviews have been undertaken and what this review will add to the literature

METHODOLOGY

The study methodology requires further explanation and detail as to how the authors systematically identified, selected and critically appraised the included studies e.g. did two reviewers independently undertake the search strategy, review titles and abstracts to determine eligibility, and rate the quality of the papers?

A PRISMA type flow diagram identifying numbers of papers from relevant databases should be included

SEARCH STRATEGY

I have concerns that the search strategy may have excluded significant numbers of papers and advise that it is re-run based on the comments below. Can the authors please explain why only hip and knee OA were included in the search string – what about OA of the spine and other peripheral joints? Why in only some papers was an age limit included. Also if GP attitudes and beliefs about OA were included, these should have been included in the initial search strings. Please include the full search string.

It would be useful to have a section clearly outlining inclusion and exclusion criteria e.g. year included in the search, were all languages included or just English

The author used the CASP tool to appraise the quality of the studies but the ratings of the papers, and their impact are not included in the text or table

RESULTS

Table 2. The authors report the method and aims of the included studies but do not include any details of the results. The information presented should be
summarized into 2 columns and the authors include the results of the papers under the categories that they have included in the text

The authors include a systematic review which is unusual. It would be more useful to review all the papers included in that paper (Cottrell 2011) and include only the papers relevant to the topic under review

In the text the authors report the results under four headings – however there are 5 headings in italics - is ‘follow-up and referral’ part of ‘management of condition’, if so please remove italics

DISCUSSION

Focuses too much on repeating the results, the implications of the results reported on should be discussed

Minor Essential Revisions

METHODS

Line 6 and 7 need to be re-worded as I am unclear as to the meaning.

RESULTS

Page 7 line 7 and 8 please correct referencing

Page 7 second line from bottom ‘non-steroidal’ should have a small ‘n’

Please do not start the beginning of a sentence with an abbreviation

Table 2 Put country where research was undertaken in the same column as the author

Discretionary Revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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