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Author’s response to reviews:

Liam Messin, Ph.D.
Editor, BMC Medical Education

July 15, 2019

RE: MEED-D-19-00111R1 "PAIN CURRICULA ACROSS HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONS UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN SPAIN”

Dear Dr. Messin:

This cover letter is with reference to our manuscript MEED-D-19-00111R1 entitled: "PAIN CURRICULA ACROSS HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONS UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN SPAIN.” We appreciate the thoughtful evaluations of the paper. In the revised manuscript, we have attempted to address each of the comments and suggestions made by you and the Reviewers. Responses to the specific suggestions follow. All changes to the text appear in red font.
Reviewer reports:

Maha El Tantawi, PhD (Reviewer 1): I thank the authors for responding to most of my previous comments.

Authors’ response: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Please find some minor comments to clarify the writing so that researchers can readily use it as a reference about pain curricula. Three of them are related to the title/Abstract so that they accurately reflect what the paper talks about and the other three are about Discussion related to avoiding repeated content and providing context through comparing to other studies:

[Authors’ NOTE: We are copying the comments and suggestions from the reviewer into this response letter to describe how we addressed them in the text. Please see the revised manuscript for specific actions].

1. Study title after "Spain": Pls modify this to: Catalonia, Spain
Authors’ response: Done as requested.

2. Abstract/Methods- P1, L28: Pls add at the end of this sentence "... and Veterinary Science.": in Catalonia, Spain
Authors’ response: Done as requested.

3. Comment from previous version: Pls add the type of statistical test used at the end of the Abstract
Authors’ response: Done as requested.

4. P7, L11-19: Pls remove this part. It is repeated and confuses readers.
Authors’ response: Done as requested.
5. P10, L1-5: Pls mention briefly the hrs for each study in these 5 references #13, 8, 10, 9 and 14. The paragraph consists of 5.5 lines. Of these, the authors used 3.5 lines to reiterate the present study findings which can already be found in the page before. Maybe to avoid making this part very long, the mention of the present study finding can be reduced and the average number in each of the 5 studies referenced here can be added. It is true that this study isn’t abt comparing to other studies. However, comparing the present finding to previous studies is an integral part of any discussion (pls check STROBE reporting guidelines checklist at https://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists

Authors’ response: We agree with the reviewer that comparison with available data is important and a critical part of any Discussion section. In fact, we do compare information/data in our manuscript by explicitly stating that “These [our] results are similar to those reported in previous studies in Australia and New Zealand(13), Canada(8), Norway (10), United Kingdom(9) and the USA(14). “ Therefore, in our previous response, we did not mean to say that comparison is not important, it is. However, we were highlighting that giving a complete summary of the information collected in these five studies would be excessive. Providing information for all the studies about all degrees would not only be long, but also difficult to do: different methods have been used, and different studies have been analyzed. This might be a potential explanation for the fact that none of the studies that have been conducted, and that we cite in our manuscript, provide such a comparison. Therefore, although we were willing to do so, we have had to limit the edits to the paragraph. First, we now only cite the works that we can directly compare (those that used the same method) and have collected information from more than one program/school. In addition, we provide an example to illustrate the point (we use Medicine as this has been analyzed by all studies, and for its greater potential interest to future readers; please, see page 10).

6. This sentence (P10, L8-13) begins a paragraph talking about compulsory and elective subjects. Pls link the two idea and discuss them or separate them since they are two different ideas.

Furthermore, if there will be no interpretation of it, comparison to previous studies or any other comment, pls remove it.

Authors’ response: We agree with the reviewer that these are two separate ideas, and we have deleted one of them (see page 10).
Cormac Ryan (Reviewer 2): I would like to congratulate the authors on this very interesting piece of work

Authors’ response: We thank the reviewer for the kind comment.

my only additional piece of feedback is the addition of a single word - page 11 Line 5 change "they reported that had essentially" to "they reported that THEY had essentially".

Authors’ response: Done as requested (see page 11 Line 5)

We hope that the revisions we made adequately address the concerns raised by the reviewers. We look forward to hearing from you regarding the status of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Jordi Miró, Ph.D.

Universitat Rovira i Virgili