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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

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

The authors write on page 4 that “the aim of the study was to present in a comprehensive manner the existing consensus regarding the diagnosis, management and prognosis of pregnancy-related pelvic girdle pain”. It is well defined, but it is hard to see that they

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

BMC writes in their instruction to authors that:

“A key aim of BMC Medicine mini-reviews is to provide evaluations of progress in a specific field. They should aim to put research findings published in the preceding 1-2 years into a clinical context and to explain future directions for research as appropriate. “

In 2008 Vleeming et al. published “The European Guidelines on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Pelvic Girdle Pain”, and one should think that these Guidelines must be a natural starting point for an update in the field. Furthermore it would be expected that later publications (papers published after the Guidelines, eg after 2006) should be highlighted. It is difficult to see that this is done in this paper. The number of references is quite high, but several of them seem to be old to fulfill the aim of a mini-review.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The reference list for the present paper contains a total of 234 papers; 126 of these are referred to in the text. Among the 108 that is not used, 27 are published after 2006 (after the Guidelines). It is difficult to understand why these 108, and especially the 27 that are new, are not referred to or evaluated in this mini-review? It seems unfavorable to leave out such a large number of new publications in an update.

The first column in table 1 gives an overview of keywords, I wonder why low back pain has been used, and lumbopelvic pain has not? The latter is a term often used on pain in the low back and pelvic area in relation to pregnancy, and several studies have used this term.
Furthermore, there are only 34 papers on low back pain (LBP) listed in table 1. It is difficult to understand how the authors have come up with this low number of papers on LBP, and also on some of the other search terms. By doing a search on Pubmed on two of the used keywords (low back pain, pelvic instability) in combination with pregnancy, the number of papers was much higher than shown in table 1.

Although a mini-review, a clear description of the methodology used for the “extraction” of the literature is expected in a scientific paper.

On page 12 the authors comment on the quality of the reviewed manuscripts. However, I have not been able to find any description of the basis used for this evaluation of quality.

It is also hard to see that the illustrations (especially figure 2) are relevant.

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

There seems to be inadequate use of references in the text, e.g. there are firm statements without proper use of references. One example; from page 7 the paragraph about differential diagnosis is completely without references. If the conclusion of the paragraph represents a consensus, extracted from the literature, it lacks references to support this.

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

It is difficult to follow the authors on their procedures or methods from the aim, what they have done (methodology) and furthermore how they are reaching their conclusions.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

It is difficult to see that this paper represents an update in the field of pregnancy-related Pelvic Girdle Pain.

7. Is the writing acceptable?

yes

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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