Author’s response to reviews

Title: Negative Pain Management Index scores do not necessarily indicate inadequate pain management: a cross-sectional study

Authors:
Naoki Sakakibara (nsakaki@luke.ac.jp)
Takahiro Higashi (thigashi@ncc.go.jp)
Itsuku Yamashita (iyamashita@aomori-kenbyo.jp)
Tetsusuke Yoshimoto (chukyo_plenty_0526917151@yahoo.co.jp)
Motohiro Matoba (teamkanwa@gmail.com)

Version: 1 Date: 31 Jan 2018

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Reviewers and Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript “Negative Pain Management Index scores do not necessarily indicate inadequate pain management: a cross-sectional study” (PCAR-D-17-00141), which we have revised in response to editor and reviewers’ suggestions.

For the current revision, we complemented the explanation about the research method and deepened the consideration of the limitation of the research and its influence.

The changed parts are marked in red. We also had our manuscript edited by professional English language services. We believe has improved our manuscript.

Our responses to each point are presented below:
Editor Comments:

Please clarify in the "Ethics approval and consent to participate" section whether the informed consent obtained was written or verbal.

If verbal, please indicate the reason for obtaining verbal rather than written consent and whether the ethics committee approved this form of consent.

- We have added necessary information (second sentence of the Ethics approval and consent to participate section on page 9).

Reviewer1

The authors used a single item instrument for the evaluation of perceived interference with pain. This instrument is not well known and therefore cannot be considered as a gold standard for the assessment of pain interference with daily activities. Because I do not have access to the paper referred to, I cannot check whether the single item instrument has been validated for its psychometric characteristics. Information on the psychometric characteristics should be summarized in this manuscript. The authors had better used the BPI for the evaluation of pain interfering with daily activities. This instrument has been validated worldwide for its use in cancer-related pain.

In the discussion the authors comment on the use of the single item instrument. However, the comment is rather short and does not reflect a clear scientific insight in the limitations of using this instrument. I like to ask a more balanced discussion on the use of the single-item instrument. I also would advise to better define the terms sensitivity and specificity in the methods section. The definitions given are not complete.

- As reviewers’ pointed out, description of the PI had somewhat insufficient. Given the simplicity of the single question of PI, we did not refer to the psychometric characteristics of PI
in detail. However, we at least added the reference of the difference in the mean NRS between those with PI and those without in the Results section. (Last sentence of the Characteristics of study patients on page 4.) Also, we have added about limitations of the use of the single item instrument on Discussion section (Line 55 on page 7 to line 3 on page 8.)

- The definition of sensitivity and specificity is in the latter half of the Data analysis section. We presume that the explanation that we treated PMI<0 or -1 as the test and the PI as the gold standard was not clear. We added several words to clarify it. Please let us know if there is some more things we could improve.(Line 51 on page 3 to line 3 on page 4)