

PART 1: Article Title: *Health Disparities in Pain: Leveraging Quantitative*

	Editor's comment	Author's comment (<i>If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here</i>)
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes, pain management and evaluation are very important topics.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	The structure of the writeup is good and the sections provide a good flow for reading the material	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The reference list contains appropriate source material both foundational to the testing protocols used and more current material affiliated with current material.	

Sensory Testing and Health-Related Measures to Identify Risk Factors for Chronic Pain.

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> The possible ethical issues associated with “pain” inflicted during the study were addressed and described so no further ethical issues were present.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	None apparent	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No plagiarism concerns	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	No history disclaimer needed	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

This declaration is missing and needs to be added

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9) Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)</p>	<p>Overall I think the article is well structure and has an important topic focus and with minor revisions is ready for publication. In addition to the declaration of competing interest needing to be included, a more fully describe the intervention decision is needed.</p> <p>What I mean by this is why the PPT location was solely delivered on the trapezius muscle alone? I know that in the PPT protocol the midpoint trapezius muscle location that was used in this study is common, however this study did not include a “distant” location such as the quadricep or tibialis anterior, which are often the secondary points used, to evaluate local pain (in the trap) and generalized pain using more than one PPT site. I am not saying that the study is lacking as a result of not using the distant follow up location, however this is not addressed as a limitation or a reasoning for only selecting the trap location. Addressing the decision to only use a single point for the PPT evaluation should be included.</p>

I have attached the assessment evaluation for the "Health Disparities in Pain..." Article to this email. There are two minor elements that I feel are missing and need to be addressed in the article write up and they are highlighted in light blue on the assessment form. The first is there is not declaration of conflict of interest that needs to be added. Second, there is a concept of a secondary site for PPT that was not included in this study. As I mentioned in the evaluation, this does not mean that the study is lacking, however the author needs to address the deviation of PPT protocol of evaluating pain tolerance at multiple sites on the body. This could simply be additional paragraph explanation of the reasoning behind the decision in this study. Whatever the decision, that needs to be discussed in the article.

Please let me know if there are additional questions or concerns that need to be discussed.

Thank you.