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Reviewer's report:

General

This revised manuscript is significantly improved. The authors were responsive to the previous critiques and have aptly addressed most concerns.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I have just two suggestions for this revised version. First, although I appreciate the authors’ rationale for performing percent agreement for the test-retest reliability analyses, I still recommend adding the intra-class correlations to Table 4. In fact, the values are very similar to the percent agreement calculations (and don’t appear inflated). I believe that for many readers who are more familiar with interpreting intra-class correlations for test-retest reliability it will be useful to see these analyses as well. Second, I would be interested in the authors’ thoughts on why little of the overall variance in troublesome pain was explained in their multivariate analyses (which range from only 25% to 37% of the variance). Although the authors raise this point on p. 15, I would like to see them offer more discussion as I believe this is an important issue in understanding troublesomeness as a concept. For example, do the authors expect that other measures (sociodemographics, medical, or psychological variables) would have more strongly predicted troublesomeness scores?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.