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**Major Compulsory Revisions**

**Abstract**

• ‘... The annual consultation-based prevalence for generalised problems was 556/10,000.’ What is ‘generalised problems’? Unspecified problems?

**Introduction**

• As you mentioned that ‘Musculoskeletal problems are one of the most common reasons for seeking primary care…’ Since it has already been known, what is the specific reason(s) for conducting the study? Please clarify.

**Methods**

• Based on my limited understanding of the UK system, I don’t really understand the section about Identification of codes and allocation to regions.

**Results**

• There is no result about Identification of codes and allocation to regions?

**Discussion**

• It seems that you focused the discussion to the findings about the prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms in general practice. How about the validity of the findings (because the data was translated from one to another system)?

• It would be of interest to include hypotheses to explain each important finding.

• It would be more completed with one paragraph for clinical implication of the findings.

Table 1 I don’t understand about ‘Total (with age-gender standardized)’.
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