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Reviewer's report:

In my opinion this is an interesting and mostly well-written article about the burden of illness among fibromyalgia patients. The study is perhaps a little too small for some of the analyses presented?

Major Compulsory Revision: I have one major item that has to be justified. In the analyses of patient perception of treatment effectiveness and satisfaction treatment seems to mean medication, and nothing else. In my part of Europe (in the North) several treatment modalities are used for FM patients like physiotherapy, self-management courses, psychological cognitive treatments, paced physical activity and others. Perhaps medication is the dominating form of therapy in France, but that has to be justified and commented.

Minor Essential Revisions: The use of n in both heading and content of tables seems to be unnecessary. Sometimes the n inside the table differs from the heading probably due to missing values. But I suggest to present n only once in each table.

In the discussion on limitations of the study I suggest to add comments about the size of the study and especially the appropriateness of analyzing the data about work stratified on the three severity levels. Or alternatively do these analyses where n is rather small on sample not divided into severity groups? Trends that were non-significant is probably due to the low n (and very low power) in these analyses?

My comment under major compulsory revision about definition of treatment might also be discussed under limitations?

Discretionary revisions: In my opinion this article would gain on presenting fewer results in tables and in the result presentation. A more careful selection of the main results will give a more reader friendly article, in my opinion.

Figure 2 and 3 might be better presented in a table? Table 4 in my opinion present to much information for one table.

The abbreviated term HRU is used in the text without being defined and explained, or did I miss the definition?

In the description of health professional use by FM patients it might once again
be cultural differences, but I still wonder: do not FM patients in France use a lot of other health professionals than doctors?

I also got curious about the fact that 18 centers recruited only 88 patients. Why did each center recruit so few patients (short time for inclusion, many patients did not want to participate, problems with motivation in staff or something else ???).
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