Reviewer’s report

Title: Multisite peripheral joint pain: A cross-sectional study of prevalence and impact on general health, quality of life, pain intensity and consultation behaviour.

Version: 0 Date: 11 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Paul Bruno

Reviewer's report:

Title: Multisite peripheral joint pain: a cross-sectional study of prevalence and impact on general health, quality of life, pain intensity, and consultation behaviour

Reviewer Report

This manuscript describes a cross-sectional population survey study investigating the prevalence of joint pain in four peripheral sites, and the impact of such pain on general health, quality of life, and number of health care practitioner consultations. Overall, the manuscript is well-written and I do not have any major concerns regarding the study or manuscript. Below are a handful of comments and suggestions for the authors to consider to provide further clarity on certain points.

1) Lines 112-115: This sentence states that participants were asked to provide a pain intensity score for each painful peripheral joint site. Please clarify whether the participants were asked to rate the average pain, worst pain, etc. for each site.

2) Lines 126-128: This sentence states that participants were categorized into five sub-groups. Based on the results presented in Table 3 and Table 4, it seems that these sub-groups were based on number of painful joint sites (0-4). It would be helpful to state this in the text as well.

3) Lines 145-146, Table 3, Table 4: The sentence states that a 1-way ANOVA was used for the between-group comparisons for each outcome. Based on the results presented in Table 3 and Table 4, it is does not seem that any post-hoc tests pairwise comparisons were performed when the F-test was significant. Although the subsequent regression analyses provide some information in this regard, please clarify the reason for not performing and reporting post-hoc pairwise comparisons.

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

Yes
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:
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