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Reviewer’s report:

General

The manuscript is now cleaner and easier to read. I think that it adds very important information, notably it will make it difficult to continue to look for site-specific mechanical causes for symptoms in individual regions.
Looking forward to be using this as a cornerstone in my own research.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

On re-reading the text, I realize that the title could do well with a change. I propose: "The transition of reported pain in different body regions - a one-yr follow-up study of the general Swedish population".

I insist, that you need to provide us with the base-line response rate, or if you are unable to do so, honestly report this to be the case. This applies to the abstract and your methods section "participants".

Methods section, the para starting: "Assessment of possible selection bias". You should tell us which sociodemographic data you dealt with.

In the Abstract, results: Please, specify that you are talking about the 1-yr prevalence, now that you have described it also elsewhere in the text.

Background, 2nd para, 2nd sentence. "Pain at several regions has been recognized as a risk factor" is surely what you mean, not as "risk factors".

Background, last para, last sentence: Please att "at baseline and", to make the sentence read: "...simultaneously at baseline and at a one year follow-up..."

Results, last para: How did you classify the symptoms to check their consistency with the Kendall’s Tau-B? Did you use identical subclassifications or was it enough that pain in the region was reported?

Discussion, p.8, last para, first sentence. How can this study "add to the community"? Please rephrase. Something about the knowledge base, or the understanding in this community, perhaps?
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract, Results, the second confidence interval should be correct from 2.6 to 26. Results: 4th para, sentence on women, change from 9.8% etc. to 10% if you absolutely want to keep this sentence. However, would it not be a good idea to just simply state that the findings for women were similar to those of the men.

Discussion, 2nd para, 1st sentence: I think that it would add to the understanding if you added that this transition of symptoms reporting had occurred within the group.

Discussion, 4th para, last sentence: I suggest that you remove the first words “In addition” and write “Previously” instead.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Why not include your questionnaire as an appendix, as I previously suggested?

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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