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Dear Editor:

We have addressed all of the reviewers’ comments, as described on the following pages.

Regards,

Ty Borders, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
UNT School of Public Health
Response to Reviewer A’s compulsory revisions:

2. The references are numbered in the reference list.

We have noted the following changed in bold within the text.

3. Pain was not evaluated in waves 1 and 2 to limit respondent burden, as we have noted in the first paragraph of page 4. The limitations of the single item measures of frequent and severe pain are noted in the last paragraph of page 12.

4. The validity of the participation measures is addressed in paragraphs 1 and 2 of page.

5. The potential for collinearity was addressed, as noted in the first paragraph of page 7. No problem multicollinearity was found. The analyses were conducted by a health services epidemiologist and econometrician.

6. We changed the wording of the associations between participation and decision-making (first paragraph of discussion section, page 10). We did not test for interactions because there is not theoretical reason to hypothesize that the effects of participation would differ by socioeconomic status. The reviewer’s comments appear to express concern about the confounding effects of social and economic factors, which we controlled for in the multivariate analyses.

7. We clarified that there were 108 counties represented in the analyses.

8. Dx refers to diagnosis, which has been changed in the tables.
Response to Reviewer B’s discretionary revisions:

We have added more discussion about how the study’s findings are related to prior literature regarding patient participation (page 10).

We have noted the only study we are aware of that has investigated how to improve participation (last sentence of the first discussion paragraph, page 10).

The loss to follow-up issue has been mentioned in lines 10-11, page 4.

The validity of the factors, including their Cronbach’s alphas, have been further addressed on page 6.