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Reviewer's report:

- Minor Essential Revisions needed

The article is sound and should be acceptable but the authors need to add more of the research evidence and analysis, it is more of a summary at present. This may present difficulties with further writing in English, but I would prefer it to provide more evidence and analysis and be resubmitted to allow further feedback and assistance with any writing in English.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The question is not new, it adds to and reinforces other countries’ studies. It is useful for expanding the amount of evidence available.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

There is not enough evidence. I understand the research tool would have been in Turkish and may be difficult to reproduce, but the description given is limited and it would add to the article to reproduce the specific questions regarding cause and area of practice, including in the results. It is a very abbreviated report. The benefit of this study is in being able to compare various areas of practice and techniques used by physical therapists and their relationship to WRMDs. The authors aim is also to investigate personal characteristics but they do not comment on whether these influence WRMDs. These are the revisions most important to add weight to the research.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes, with a few amendments.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

There is a lot of comparison to other similar work, but little analysis of the findings for the local Turkish population. This needs further interpretation. For example, if it was found that Turkish physical therapists spend most of their time in public hospitals with heavy patients, such analysis would lead to recommendations on what type of intervention is required.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes. Please note I have corrected the abstract and other writing using the ‘markup’ feature but lost the corrections when I copied it (my confusion), the writers need to note my changes to their writing throughout by checking each sentence against their original. I have attached a corrected copy of the article in Word. The tables have been obliterated but there were no changes there.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

I have made many small corrections in the text to more correct English. Otherwise the writing is acceptable.

- Needs some language corrections before being published. I have corrected all the obvious English difficulties using the markup facility. The authors should re check these to ensure the corrections represent what they wanted to say. As a native English speaker, you can trust that my grammatical corrections are themselves correct. Well done for writing in English as a second language!

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No
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