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Reviewer's report:

This paper aims to compare pain intensity provided from anatomical landmarks of the pelvic side wall in women with pregnancy related CPP and women without such pain. The study compared the pain intensities reported on 13 anatomical landmarks of 36 parous women with CPP and 29 without CPP. They reported characteristic differences in anatomically provoked CPP pain intensity reported in women with CPP compared to those without. The way the study has been described and laid out is rather confusing. The results were also not particularly specific to the objective and outcomes described at the start. It is also unclear if the authors meant the participants were pregnant and had CPP or they had previous pregnancies and currently not pregnant and have CPP. It became apparent that it may be the latter but the authors need to clarify this.

The authors went on to report that the pain intensity reported by the women with CPP in relation to the 13 intra-pelvic landmarks were higher compared to controls. They have described a physical examination which they claim has not been generally used, could be used clinically to discriminate patients with CPP and those without.

Unfortunately I do not think the study has shown this. The study showed that women with CPP (who had been previously pregnant) were more sensitive (expressed as pain intensity) at the 13 anatomical site examination. I think there is value in perhaps describing this observation, but the conclusion will have to be adjusted. Perhaps something along the lines of 'Parous women with CPP have a heightened pain intensity over 13 anatomical landmarks during pelvic examination compared with those without CPP'? If the authors wish to provide some comment on parity, then a group who is nulliparous would be required as comparison. Otherwise there cannot be any claim on the impact of parity. 'Intra-pelvic examination' is a rather strange way of describing a 'vaginal/pelvic or bimanual examination'. It implies that it could be 'extra-pelvic'? Simpler terms also in the title will make this piece of work more readable.
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