

RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS
(WJCO- Manuscript NO.: 29586)

We thank both the reviewers for their very helpful feedback. We have tried to address the comments to the fullest extent possible. Below, please find our point by point response to the reviewers' comments.

Review	Authors' Response
Reviewer 1	
The present study attempts to investigate if patients' preference to use analgesics for cancer pain is related to numerous variables.	-
Data analysis - Page 9: Regarding the LCV score and the threshold for a distinct % change how the number of patients enrolled in the study may have affected this threshold?	We have changed the text to (adding in the bolded part: "The threshold for a distinct percent change in LCV score for data with 207 observations is 0.92% (in contrast, the percent decrease is 2.00% for 95 observations and 1.00% for 190 observations)."
Results and Tables -Page 10: A flow diagram showing patient recruitment with exclusions missing values and the reasons for missing values in the appropriate boxes is required.	We have included a flow diagram of patient recruitment (pls see page 28).
These tables are exhaustive. I do not believe that readers will spend time going through 13 or so tables. For example the authors may skip the first four tables, name in the text the variables and mention that the 207 patients did not differ regarding for example cancer stage, or employment status etc for all the variables that there is no significant difference and incorporate in one table only the variables in which a statistically significant difference is found.	We have consolidated and eliminated some of the tables as per the reviewer's suggestion. We reduced the total number of tables to 7. We believe that it would be important to present the descriptive data about the study sample. However, we consolidated tables 2-3 and eliminated all the tables presenting the individually significant variables. We only present the findings of the multiple logistic regression in the main body of the paper. We will provide the individually significant variables for each cluster as supplementary materials.
Also under each variable the number of patients analyzed must be written, Delete the a and b superscripts next to variable and at the bottom of each table, is confusing. In tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 add the number of patients under each variable type and under the variable analyzed.	We deleted the superscripts, a and b. Number of missing observations is indicated in the parenthesis after the variable (e.g., see table 1, p.20, primary insurance variable). The information about the number and % of patients analyzed for each variable type is now included in the tables retained in the manuscript (pls see tables 4-7).
Discussion -Start the Discussion with a sentence summarizing the main results of your study. Page 14: No need to repeat	We have revised the discussion as per the reviewer's suggestion (pls see Discussion, pages 15-16, 17). The changes are in red.

the results in the Discussion section. Page 16: Close the Discussion with a conclusion relating the existing clusters to the patients' preferences to consume analgesics for cancer pain.	
"The 2016 CDC guidelines provides..." change to "The 2016 CDC guidelines provide..." -	Thank you. This has been corrected (pls see page 15).
Reviewer 2	
First, there are far too many tables, one cannot see the wood for the trees - the authors should try to condense their data and perhaps provide their tables as supplementary material.	We have consolidated and eliminated some of the tables as per the reviewer's suggestion. We reduced the total number of tables to 7. We believe that it would be important to present the descriptive data about the study sample. However, we consolidated tables 2-3 and eliminated all the tables presenting the individually significant variables. We only present the findings of the multiple logistic regression in the main body of the paper. We will provide the individually significant variables for each cluster as supplementary materials.
Second, the manuscript needs some language polishing.	We have edited our manuscript for English and grammar. The changes are highlighted in tracked mode.
Third, some references are not clear to me, e.g.: On p4 the authors write: "This is important as recent studies suggest that patients' preferences are highly consequential and influence actual pain treatment decisions" - and then they cite a paper that deals with parents and their cancer suffering children; IMHO something different than mentioned in the sentence. Fourth, the authors should describe in 1-2 sentences the procedures they used - a mere reference 13 seems not enough to me (see p5).	We have revised this paragraph significantly to address the reviewer's concern including the reference in question (pls see page 5; the changes are in red).
Minor points: SAS version?	Thank you. We have included the version of the SAS software used (pls see page 11).
Ref 48 should be replaced with a more general study about fear of disease progression in cancer	We have changed reference 48 with more appropriate references (pls see pages 15-16; the changes are in red).