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Reviewer's report:

- The rational and purpose of the study is clear.

- It needs the authors clearly state that they measured acute pain not chronic pain because the respondent rate their pain in the last four weeks.

- The sampling method of 4380 women 18 to 49 yrs. from overall included sample 20460 needs to be define and explain.

- Measuring pain severity (one question with 3 limited options) and Self-rated health status (one question) are one of the main limitation of study.

- The reason of conducting non-parametric test like Chai Square to analysis the data is not clear. Because the pain severity and self-rated health could have treated as metric variable.

- The reported p value for the distribution of self-rated health status by pain severity is not defined to understand that it is a ANOVA test or Chai Square. The other issue related to the error bars with 95% confidence intervals seems it is a summary of two categorical bar chart in three groups because the Y Axes of error bar chart should be the mean not a percentage axes.

- It would be valuable to present the prevalence of pain severity, psychological distress and self-rated health status in reproductive aged women due to this fact that such information is not available in the background.

- Discussion part needs to be organised according to two hypotheses and clearly state that the hypothesis is supported by finding or not.

- Paragraph with the line number 153 to 161 are new information from previous study that can move to introduction section of the manuscript.
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.

Unable to assess

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

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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