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Reviewer’s report:

Thank-you for addressing my comments, and for your additional work in preparing this manuscript. I have an additional few comments

ABSTRACT

In the methods section you have not mentioned the CASP tool, please include

MANUSCRIPT

Methods MINOR ESSENTIAL

The sentence beginning ‘As in qualitative research’ is somewhat clumsy, could I suggest it is amended

Results

I the first paragraph please add ‘n= ‘ before the number of papers

In the results section at the beginning of each theme could you include how many papers were included

In the ‘Diagnosis’ category the last line beginning ‘there is some evidence’, could the authors elaborate what ‘may be a particular issue’ means

In the theme ‘OA and Doctor-patient relationship’, would the paper discussed in the last paragraph sit better there or in the management theme

Sentences and Paragraph titles should not begin with an abbreviation, please amend

Table 1 MAJOR COMPULSORY

To clarify the results table could I suggest that the results are displayed in 4 column relating to the themes they discussed

In the participants column could the participant numbers be written GP’s (n=11), Rheum (n=6) etc

I find the ‘comments and limitations’ column difficult to follow. Could the authors make a second table with the 10 questions related to the CASP tool written out in the horizontal axis and the result (yes, no, can’t tell) for each paper in the vertical axis. Readers will have a clearer picture of the quality of the studies I believe
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