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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the authors:

General:
For me it is not clear why GP’s should be able to manage patients with LSS; I would agree with the statement that they should take into consideration a lumbar spinal stenosis in patients with symptoms compatible (described in the paper) with this illness.
To my knowledge the decision whether to recommend surgery or another treatment to such patients is not easy and needs a lot of experience.

The discussion is much too long; (no mandatory changes in the number or words; I would prefer a focus on 1. the triage function of GP's in these patients. 2. The efficacy of non-surgical interventions including the 'lumbar belt' (excluding epidural steroid injections, which I presume are not offered in GP's offices).

Line 198; Diagnosing people with LSS: Low back pain, radicular claudication and paresthesia in lower limbs were the 3 most frequently cited clinical signs leading to the diagnosis of LSS.
Later on …in line 246 … the authors write that the above mentioned clinical signs differed from those included in the two published datasets --- and the reason for this difference is or could be the fact, that the datasets were developed by spine specialists and only 1% or less of the participants were GPs'. This argument doesn't make sense to me; please explain in the text why the percentage of GP's (which seem not to be very confident in the diagnosis of LSS) in setting up a list of diagnostic criteria for LSS should be of any relevance.

Minor
Line 313 typos, spinal disorders (25), 25).

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.
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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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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