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**Reviewer’s report:**

The manuscript reports on a simple yet prudent study. The methods are comprehensively reported. The authors do a good job of discussing the context and potential implications of the results, along with the study limitations.

I only have a couple of comments which should be addressed (major comments):

1. The rationale for why it important to understanding what agreement there is between adolescent reporting of back pain and their parents knowledge of this could be further highlighted. i.e Why is it important to corroborate adolescent reported back pain with parents? It is not until the discussion that the reader learns of some of the potential cultural factors at play.

The first sentence of the 3rd paragraph (background) is not clear.

2. The manuscript will read better with some copy editing. For instance the second sentence of statistical analysis “Parametric tests were used to describe the data due to the large sample even for heavily skewed data [21]” is hard to follow.

Or Paragraph two in discussion – regarding the modified Delphi study – the wording suggests the Delphi study was for adolescent back pain, but this in not the case.

3. One limitation, which the may undermine the results, but is not mentioned in the study ‘limitation’ section is the recall period. The authors should consider discussing the implications of the 12-month recall period on he results.

**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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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