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Reviewer's report:

I read the article about the sites and conditions of pain in a general practice geriatric assessment with great interest. The article is well and carefully written and understandable. The tile and abstract accurately convey the findings of the research. The research question is clear and adequately described in the text.

I have only some minor comments and suggestions for improvement as follows:

In the section "Background" I found the second paragraph more as a part of discussion or in a part talking about the reasons for the present research as the last paragraph of the background section.

Please provide the explanation of the abbreviation when you mentioned it at the first time (STEP, BMI in discussion).

In the first sentence of the section Recruitment of GPs and patients it is not clear, if all the invited GPs participated? Later in the text you described that that two doctors dropped out? ( 2 out of 43)

Table 2: It seems to me that the number of sites with pain described in the table should be reduced to a few location ( like hip, knee, abdomen, shoulder, cervical spine, lumbal spine) and made the table more clinically relevant.

Table 3. Doesn't bring much to the conclusion and It would be better just to briefly explain the result of bivariate analysis in the text and present only the results of multiple logistic regression as in the table 4.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below.
If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal