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ABSTRACT

Results, line 2: I suggest change to "…11,928, of which 68% reported…..". The present formulation can be misunderstood.

BACKGROUND:

- I lack a stringent line of thought in relation to OA. First it is stated that there are other types of joint pain than OA ("…OA the most common cause of joint pain….."), then goes on to state that " there is limited recognition of the prevalence of…..in those either living with or at risk of OA" for finally to state a purpose which is related to all types of peripheral joint pain. Maybe less focus on OA in the background would suit the purpose better.

- There is some mistake in line 90.

- Why not include shoulder pain, which is very prevalent and one of the most important from a socioeconomic point of view?

METHOD

- How were the 16 categories merged into 5?

- Line 133: "Pain intensity was measured as a mean composite score across…." Why composite? Shouldn't it simply be mean score across the joints?

- The analysis section should be rewritten to follow the reporting more clearly (or vice versa). I find it difficult to understand exactly what was done, when I read the results (as you can see below).
RESULTS

- Table 3: Do you mean significant difference between groups or significant trend?

- I don't understand the text on page 11. Are you saying the p-value for the difference in pain intensity between healthy weight and overweight is <0.001 and likewise between overweight and obese and between levels of deprivation? Or are you simply talking about different pain intensity in relation pain sites. Please report more clearly.

- page 13 "When analyzing the independent effect of variables on the outcome measures……." What are the outcome measures? Apparently both number of pain sites and pain intensity are independent variables, so what are the dependent variables?

- Why was pain intensity not included in the model when investigating the impact on general health and QoL, when you just showed that pain intensity had a greater negative impact than pain sites?

- Page 14: suggest delete "The numbers of those consulting did not always increase according to the number of sites of peripheral joint pain, but rather" Only the proportion makes sense.

Reporting results from Table 5, why did you single out GP and practice nurse?

DISCUSSION

Page 17, 3rd paragraph. Difference between number of pain sites and differences between pain and no pain are not comparable

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
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
Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world’s journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

No