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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Fujino and Dr O’ Higgins thank you for your comments. I have study all of them and I have made the requested corrections.

Technical Comments:

Editor Comments:

1. The statement in the design and participants section (pg 4, line 4-5) suggests that the sample consists only of individuals who report pain. If so, this is not in line with the results which state that 56.8% report chronic pain. Please clarify.

Answer

The correction has been made
2. Please indicate the N for each regression analysis.

Answer

The Ns were added in the models, as requested.

Reviewer reports:

Haruo Fujino, Ph.D. (Reviewer 1): The manuscript titled "Patients with chronic non-cancer Pain: Evaluating Depression and their Quality of Life" attempts to investigate associations between pain, depression, and quality of life in a Greek primary health care setting. The study is potentially interesting and informative; however, I have several comments for the current manuscript, which may improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. An addition of some specific words in Title may be helpful for the readers, such as "in Greek sample" or "single center study in Greece"

Answer

The correction has been made.

2. Many studies have reported associations between pain, depression, and quality of life, such as Tesio et al. 2018 Front Psychol and Tsuji et al. 2016 BMC Musculoskelet Disord. Include the summary of the previous studies.

Answer

The studies were included.

3. The method used to select participants was quasi-randomization. Please carefully avoid to use "random" in Abstract and Methods sections. Also, please describe the reasons to select 200 from 637.

Answer

The correction has been made.
Sample size of 200 participants was chosen in order to achieve 95% power to detect significant differences at 0.05 level of significance and at a effect size of 0.13 or more, via regression analysis.

4. In the first paragraph in Results section, use both number of participants and percentage, as follows: …140 (70%) participants of the study population reported a chronic disease and 24 (17.1%)…

The same applies hereafter in Results section.

In P7, "16.6% of the participants were diagnosed with depression." In P6, "11.5% of them had been diagnosed with depression." Which is correct? Please check the number of participants carefully.

Answer

The Ns were added in the results section, as requested. Concerning depression 11.5% refers to those that had been diagnosed by a physician with depression, while 16.6% refers to those that had been scored high on the PHQ depression questionnaire. We have added the details in the text.

5. P7, There are several sentences that describes differences in groups, such as "Women and those who mentioned suffering a mental disorder had more pain". Show t-/F-values and p-values for those results in text or Tables. The same applies in Results section.

Answer

t-/F-values etc. were added in the results section and in the tables.

6. P-values reported in Results section were not applied Bonferroni correction or corrected significance threshold. Apply the correction for the multiple testing.

Answer

Bonferroni correction was applied in case of multiple testing and the information is provided in the statistical analysis section.
7. Describe which variables were used as explanatory variables in multiple regression analysis. Additionally, to strengthen your conclusions, you can use hierarchical multiple regression with enter method for prediction of quality of life: 1st step: demographics and clinical variables, 2nd: pain measures and depression. It would show the significant increase of explained variance by 2nd steps even after controlling demographic and clinical variables.

Answer

The explanatory variables used for each dependent variable was added in the statistical analysis section and in the title of the tables. We have decided to use the stepwise method since some of the independent variables are collinear and it is problematic to be together in the regression model. This is the reason that we have avoided to run a model with the method of "enter", or a hierarchical one.

8. I cannot find any results analyzed using logistic regression analysis. Also, multiple regression analysis was not described in statistical analysis section.

Answer

We are sorry! The statistical analysis section was corrected. It is linear instead of logistic.

9. In P10, please discuss the similarities and differences between the current and previous studies. Summarize the main finding in the first sentence, and then discuss the interpretation and compare the results with previous findings.

Answer

The corrections have been made.

Minor comments:

10. In P5, "Each one is classified within three levels of gravity", it can be severity?

Answer

The correction has been made.
11. Generally, beta shows a standardized value in multiple regression. Carefully check the values in Table 5.

Answer

The betas presented in the tables, are not the standardized one, but are the simple regression coefficients of the model. This is referred in the statistical analysis section.

12. P7 the third line from the bottom, was it "estimated"? If so, describe how the value was estimated.

Answer

It wasn’t “estimated” it was calculated. The correction was made.

13. The second paragraph in P9, "training and resources to asses" -&gt; assess.

Answer

The correction has been made.

14. Clearly describe the proportion, such as 70% instead of "seven out of ten" (four, two, ...) in P9.

Answer

The corrections have been made.

15. Use the decimal point, not a comma throughout the manuscript (including text and tables).

Answer

the corrections have been made.