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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Answer: The objective of this study was to assess the incremental burden of physical pain in real-world patients with depression in Japan and the association between physical pain and the severity of depression. This objective is OK, but it would be better if the objectives focus in the prevalence of physical pain in depressed patients and find the associated factors of physical pain in this population.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Answer: The study was very large, which included a large data source of Japan and used stratified random sampling. All subjects gave informed consents. The Measurement covered all the areas of objectives. The analysis was not complex. It would be interesting to used complex statistical analysis with the large data source.

3. Are the data sound?
   Answer: Good

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Answer: It would be better to have a figure to show the flow of respondents.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Answer: If the authors correct some points, it would be OK.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Answer: If the authors correct some points, it would be OK.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Answer: If the authors discuss more and clearly about the weak and the strong points of this study, it would be OK.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Answer The references were too old; it would be OK if the authors cite more update references.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Answer Yes

10. Is the writing acceptable? There are large numbers of respondents in this paper (more than 1000).
Answer Please check for the language. If the authors correct some points, it would be OK.

Another comments were highlight in the manuscript point by point.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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