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PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study
INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

No - manuscript has some fundamental flaw(s)

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: While the concerns of the first review were relatively well addressed, those for the second reviewer appear to have presented more difficulty because they relate to fundamental problems in study design.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Reviewer 1 asks for a definition of a thematic analysis and the authors state, "Data were analysed using thematic analysis, a widely used qualitative method of data analysis". This is not a direct response to the question, i.e., a definition.

Reviewer 1 asks for a hypothesis that guided this study; a reasonable request of any scientific work. The author's response is, "As this is an exploratory qualitative study, it would not be appropriate to add in a hypothesis as this term applies only to quantitative research. This is particularly the case with regard to the exploratory nature of the study. As such, we have not added a hypothesis." This term does not only apply to quantitative studies as stated, although some quantitative findings are presented herein, and even exploratory studies employ hypotheses. Except for minor changes here or there, the author responses tend to be evasive.
Nothing can be said about sex differences with only one male in the sample. Who is to say that the one male reflected the male mixed chronic pain population? The group analysis in Table 1 shows subgroups of 3, 4 and 6 subjects. A subgroup analysis with such few subjects is completely inadequate.

Please note that gender refers to social norms and expectations; not sex. "Sex" refers to the biological differences between males and females, such as the genitalia and genetic differences. "Gender" refers to the role of a male or female in society or an individual's concept of themselves as in gender identity.

Critical issues as a hypothesis, subject number and statistics are brushed aside as the study is mostly termed "qualitative." This approach is not rigorous enough for this reviewer. One male is not adequate no matter how many "authorities" have been consulted. Frankly, 13 females are also inadequate for a study that reports findings for three groups of patients. Note that the Stinson article is for one pain condition; arthritis. Thus, a smaller sample could be justified.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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