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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

line 28: when using %, a better clarification is needed (e.g. has to be explained that 62% is not taken from 100% but from the 53% which answered).

line 32: why the questions about health status has not been asked in the first questionnaire?

line 41: "The participants with RP constituted an intermediate group regarding diabetes, frequency and intensity of pain, and impact on work".. should be stated more clearly..which is the relationship between diabetes and RP?

line 73: the german study cited, relates to chronic pain. Is not possible to compare them, at least should be explained what happens in the transition to chronic pain and which mechanisms are involved.

line 118: "A better understanding is needed about the relationship between the severity of chronic pain (e.g., spreading of pain) and occurrence of a broad spectrum of comorbidities"... in general in the background the authors ofter refers to "chronic widespread pain", and i think could be confusing for the reader cause the topic is about RP, LP and WSP, regardless pain's cronicity (even if investigated).

line 304: number of subjects and % are creating confusion to the reader. 6% (246) of the responders had WSP, but using the ACR criteria this number becomes 10% (418)..could you explain why?

line 310: these 103 subjects exluded should be nominated before in the text, before numbers an % are provided.

line 328: "Regarding diabetes, RP was the intermediate group (statistically significant)".. what do you mean with this sentence? what is the statistically significant result?

line 343: "was statistically significantly worse in WSP, intermediate in RP, and best in LP".. state the sentence without the use of "worse" and "best"

line 352: for RP, 88% remained in the same category, 3% transformed into WSP and 10% into LP..88+3+10=101%.
for LP, 56% remained in the same category, what about the others?

line 388: "WSP was the lowest/worse and LP was the highest/best." Again, I think the use of "worse" and "best" is not appropriated.

line 392: try to give a possible explanation of this transition.

discretionary revisions

line 396: "The limited time spent weekly on demanding physical activity among individuals with pain indicates.." in the questionnaire should have been investigated if they were not performing sport activities because of the pain or just because they don't use to. Maybe they were not performing sport even before the onset of pain.

line 483: it would have been interesting not evaluate the transition from one condition to another after the 9 weeks, but during the 9 weeks. Asking about the pain in one specific moment (when they were asked to fill the questionnaire) could have to many bias, investigating about how the pain has evelved during the 9 weeks (an average of the pain) could make the author's statements stronger.
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