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Reviewer’s report:

General
A well planned out study in a relatively unexplored area.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The last paragraph in the discussion section makes contradictory statements to what is evident from results or conclusion. Authors must go through this and revise.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In the legends for figures we have fig. 3 a and b while the figures are labelled fig 3 and 4

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It will be helpful if the authors can state how their results impact on the use of pain drawing in clinical practice in the discussion/conclusion section.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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