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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. A range of reliability measures are reported at line 144 and 145. Please provide which reliability measure you have used, e.g. Kappa.
2. The statistical method used in the study should be clearer at line 169-172. Do you mean that you have used a backward stepwise regression procedure when you write “The threshold for variant removal was set at 0.10”?
3. From the cross-sectional design of the study, it can be concluded that Tables 1, 4 and 5 show the association between, e.g., demographic factors and chronic pain and not the risk. The titles of these tables should therefore be reworded.
4. In the footnotes in Tables 1, 4 and 5 it becomes clear that you have adjusted for sex and family history of chronic pain. Please provide a description of this in the method section. In Table, the odds ratios of gender is reported, but in the footnotes you have written that you have adjusted for sex and family history of chronic pain. Please correct the footnote.
5. It should become clear from Tables 1, 4 and 5 that you have included all variables in the model, both direct and indirect indicators.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. A little comment to the statement “By investigating the current academic pressure situation in Chinese adolescents and analyzing the relationships between various learning burden-related risk factors and different types of chronic pain, this study has provided a reference for improving adolescent health.”

Adolescents with high academic pressure could probably be a target group for prevention initiatives, but this study has not provided that adolescent health has been improved. Therefore, the sentence should be moderated. In addition, I do not think that this statement belongs to the introduction.
2. The design of the study is probably meant to be described at line 110 in the method section. Therefore, the sentence should be changed to “…cross-sectional study was conducted instead”.
3. Is the cross-sectional design a true limitation of the study? I think cross-sectional studies have its rights when you want to explore associations as you want in this study. In the next step, you can perform longitudinal studies to
explore the causal relationship.

4. Please use the correct reference style for BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. The citation should be in brackets and as superscript.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Please see Instructions for authors; if you want to keep the “Evaluation” section, it should have a minor subheading instead of a major heading as in Methods and Results. Please consider to include the Evaluation section in the discussion.
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