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Reviewer's report:

Title of this study is clear and relevant. Abstract of the study written appropriately. Objective of the study is clear but some of the references used in the manuscript is relevant but too old.

In the methods section: i think author can tell the comparative cross-sectional study also. It is not clear about the validation of the the used tool, Musculoskeletal Screening Protocol (MSP). What was the procedure of data collection? is it face to face interview? were the data collected by interviewer? or self administered? if collected by interviewer then whats about their training? Only pain considered here? but MSD has other symptoms like sensory loss, motor function disorder etc., on the other hands, if any one is on treatment by NSAID or steroid what was inclusion criteria. or if any one has no MSD but he/she had previously and treated.

In result: I will suggest put a table for prevalence of MSD with age group, then the age effect can be understand and which region affected in which age group? other behavioral factors and medication or existing diseases history were not reported here which may vary the prevalence.

Discussion: it is well written and compared accordingly.

Conclusions: written appropriately.

Overall: it is a good work among the solders because they are always suffered by this issue but can not report properly for the fear of job.

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.

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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