Reviewer’s report

Title: Psychological distress and self-rated health status in reproductive aged women with pain: findings from a national, cross-sectional survey

Version: 0 Date: 09 Dec 2018

Reviewer: Mike Armour

Reviewer's report:

Thanks to the authors for this interesting paper looking at the relationship between pain severity and distress in reproductive aged women, with a focus on the antenatal and postpartum period. Overall I think this is an excellent piece of work and only have minor comments.

Line 78: Is there any examples for bodily pain that are used in the questioning process ? might help give the reader some idea of what can fall under 'bodily pain'

Line 121-128: While it is clear that self-rated health status changes with pain severity, the wording implies that as pain severity goes up self-rated health status goes down. But looking at Fig 1 (a) this doesn't seem to be quite so simple. The proportion of women rating their health as 'excellent' is higher in the severe pain group than in the no pain group. Perhaps a few words just so those who read the text only are aware of this.

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.

Unable to assess

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 recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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