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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done an admirable job of addressing my questions and comments. Their responses were thoughtful and thorough. The additional information provided allows the reader a better understanding of the rationale for the study and the methods. The additional background also puts the study into the greater context of the literature regarding CBT with those who have an intellectual disability.

There remain several issues to address:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. I understand that the Pain Coping Strategies Questionnaire and the Pain Coping Scenarios Questionnaire have been used in only one previous study. However, the authors should include some results from that previous study when describing the measure to help the reader evaluate their psychometrics. If no psychometric analyses were conducted as part of the previous study, this should be stated and a brief description of how they were used should be provided. The authors indicate in their response that psychometric analyses will be included in this current project – but none are described in the analyses section. Please indicate how the reliability and validity will be assessed quantitatively in this current study. What analyses will be done?

2. I agree with the authors that pain intensity is not likely to be the factor that is most impacted by this intervention (typically function and coping improve most). However, those less well acquainted with typical responses to pain treatment programs may find this counter-intuitive. To help those readers understand the secondary role of pain intensity as an outcome, the authors should provide a brief explanation, referring to outcomes that have been reported for other studies of psychological pain management programs. This will allow the reader to understand why pain intensity is not the key target of the intervention.

3. The authors now explain that the Brief Pain Inventory will be a modified version. Thank you. Please explain whether this specific modified version has been used before, or whether it is being generated for this study.

4. Please provide a brief description of the actual psychometric results for the Self-Efficacy Scale from the previous study with children by Bursch et al.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. The description of the self-efficacy scale is still somewhat vague. The manuscript now states it will be completed “with participants”. Does this mean it will be read to them?

Thank you for addressing my previous questions and comments. I am hopeful that you will be able to make the changes listed above as well, and I believe that with these, the manuscript is very strong.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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