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“Factors associated with chronic pain in patients with bipolar depression: a cross-sectional study” by Failde I et al.

Advice on publication:
The article could be suitable for publication after compulsory revision regarding the patient sample. Although the manuscript has greatly improved, I still have a major concern:

- The response to question 2 (regarding the subsample of 121 patients) to my mind is still not satisfying. I feel it is not clear in the Methods section how these patients were selected, and more specifically if these patients are first time visitors than where does the bipolar diagnosis come from? (and also the other depressive diagnoses) Several lines concerning patient recruitment in the Methods section have now been removed and authors only refer to Aguera et al 2011, but the selection process is still not clear, for instance how many bipolar depressed patients refused to participate?

Minor essential revisions:

- Also, I still have trouble interpreting the delayed diagnosis of bipolar depression, which as the reviewers state in their response, was not measured, but the findings are interpreted as if delayed diagnosis was measured.

- The third question (regarding borderline significant results) is now properly addressed in the Discussion section, though it is still a major weakness of this study. I still feel a lot of emphasis is placed on non-significant results in the Results section (for instance male vs female pain prevalence).

- To my mind not all questions that were raised by the Editor have been properly addressed. For instance, regarding questions 1 to 3, adjustments to the
Introduction have been made, but I feel the remarks do not really answer the reviewers’ questions (like NSAIDs’ benefits?). Also, the added text is not linked to the objectives of the study.
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