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To
Professor Siddharta Sidkar
Executive Editor
*BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders*

December 3, 2012

From
Niklaus Egloff, MD
Department of General Internal Medicine
University Hospital
CH-3010 Bern
Switzerland

**RE: 2nd revision of MS No. 2326919677165043 (BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders)**

entitled “Pain Drawings in Somatoform-Functional Pain”

Dear Professor Sidkar

Thank you very much for your re-review of our above-referenced manuscript. We appreciated the minor comments from Referee 1 and enclosed a point-by-point response to each of his criticisms. We highlighted all changes made to the text in the revised manuscript in red color.

The authors confirm that the manuscript or parts of it have not previously been published. We also confirm that the manuscript or parts of it are not under review elsewhere. All authors approved the final version of the revised manuscript and declare that they do not have any conflict of interest.

Sincerely yours,

Niklaus Egloff

(on behalf of all co-authors)
Responses to the Comments from Referee 1 (Peter Henningsen)

Comment 1
The authors should highlight in the limitations section of the discussion the fact that despite the control of covariates it cannot be excluded that differences in pain drawings were due to factors other than the type of pain (e.g. different clinical setting).

Response
We added the following two sentences to the discussion, p11, last paragraph:
“We emphasize several limitations of our pilot study.”
“Although we controlled for important demographic and clinical covariates, we are unable to exclude the possibility that factors other than the type of pain (e.g., the different clinical setting) might have contributed to differences in PD.”

Comment 2
The authors should highlight in the limitations section of the discussion the fact that assessment of pain drawings with only one rater does not allow to draw conclusions about the inter-rater reliability of this type of more quantitative pain drawing rating.

Response
On p5, 2nd line, we changed the following sentence “To limit interrater variability, the evaluation of all PDs was carried out by only one investigator” to “The evaluation of all PDs was carried out by only one investigator.”
We added the following sentence to the discussion, p13, bottom of page: “Assessment of PD with only one rater does not allow to draw conclusions about the interrater reliability of PD.”

Comment 3
On p10, line 9, “meaning” should be changed to “opinion”.

Response
Done as suggested by the Referee.