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Reviewer’s report:

This study is very well designed, the topic is relevant, but there are some problems of clarity and consistency that should be solved.

1- My major concern regarding this manuscript is about "novelty". Apparently, the authors have published a few papers as a result of the same investigation. They cite two, but there are others, e.g.: Haraldstad K, Christophersen KA, Eide H, Nativg GK, Helseth S. Predictors of health-related quality of life in a sample of children and adolescents: a school survey. J Clin Nurs. 2011 Nov;20(21-22):3048-56. So, I encourage the authors to highlight, in the manuscript, their advances in the knowledge with their already published studies and the present one. Are there redundant data? Is it justified another publication by the same group of authors originated from this sample and data? It seems that the authors had collected other variables that could be analyzed in the regression models in the same manuscript.

2- The ABSTRACT needs more information on data values found in the Results. Please do not bring new results in the Conclusions. Besides, try not to repeat results in the Conclusions.

3- INTRODUCTION: The relevance of the topic is very well presented in the Introduction. However, the originality of this study is superficially described. Please explain the limitations of the studies ref. # 5, 19-21 (page 4, lines 31-34) that the present investigation intends to address. What is/are the specific gap/s in the literature that this study aims to fill in?

4- METHODS:

4.1- Describe the relevant dates, including periods of recruitment and data collection.

4.2- Give the exclusion criteria.

4.3- Page 7, lines 19-21: Give more specific information on what pain questions were used.

4.4- Page 7, line 53: BMI ??????

4.5- Was the data normally distributed?

4.6- Please be more specific about when Pearson correlations were used.

5- RESULTS:
5.1- The first paragraph should report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—e.g., numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, and analyzed. Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. Therefore, the information brought in the Methods (Page 5, lines 41-56) should be transferred to the Results.

5.2- Page 8, lines 32-33: Was the nationality assessed according to the father only or both parents?

5.3- Page 8, lines 49-52: A better description of the pain variable data would give more soundness to the Results.

5-4- Table 2: correct the typo "Totalt". Report the statistical tests used as a table footnote.

6- DISCUSSION:

6.1- Page 10, lines 17-20: "21% reported pain lasting more than 3 months". I did not see this result in the appropriate section.

6.2- Page 11, lines 12-17: I am afraid that authors should be more cautious with the following statement: "The results of our study indicates that living with pain has negative physical, mental, and social consequences for the children, and that pain is a symptom of a multidimensional health problem". Do this study design and results support that report?

6.3- Please describe this study limitations.

7- CONCLUSIONS:

7.2- Why is absenteeism mentioned? I did not see any results on it. Please rewrite the Conclusions to keep it coherent with the aims of the study and the results found, preventing to have conclusions not supported by the results.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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