Dear Editor and Reviewer:

Authors appreciated all the positive comments and correct every aspects that were focus in the review of the paper.

Review article #10500.

Gestão da dor oncológica em situações específicas / Management of cancer pain in

special settings.

RELEVANCE:

This is a well written review of drugs useful to manage pain in cancer patients.

Is the manuscript globally important for the clinical practice? – Yes.

Will it help physicians improving their practice and therefore their approach to

patients? - Yes

Does it involve clinical, scientific, social, political and economic factors affecting

healthcare? - Yes

ORIGINALITY: What does this manuscript add to the current knowledge?

Don´t add new information, but is well organized, is directed over the good medical

practice and is easy to understand.

MISCONDUCT: Plagiarism, fraudulent and unreliable data, double or bias in

publication. - No

STRUCTURE OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Title: Is it instructive and short? Does it summarize the manuscript ? – Yes.

Abstract: Does it reflect the contents of the manuscript? Is it well structured? Does it

efficiently summarize the content? - Yes

Introduction: Are the objectives clearly described? Does it explain the relevance of the

study? - Yes.

Methods:

Does it describe how the objectives were reached? – Yes.

Are the study design and methodology appropriate to its objectives? – Yes.

Are there any methodological failures? - No

Is the statistical method accurate? Is the methodology inepidemiological based

manuscripts adequate? – Not apply.

Results:

Is data presentation and analysis accurate? – Yes.

Are the results clear and convincing? – Yes.

Are the charts and tables legible and correctly designed? – Yes. Really well designed.

Discussion:

Does it explain the relevance of the results? – Yes.

**Question 1**

Does it describe any limitation? – No to much.

Does it describe any areas in need of further study? – No

*Answer: These sections were included in discussion.*

Conclusions:

Are conclusions relevant? Are these related to the objectives? Are these based on the

results? Yes.

References:

Was the literature review considered adequately? – Yes.

**Question 2**

Does it follow AMP’s style? – No – Is necessary to review.

The main objective of peer-review is to ensure the accuracy of the manuscript and

therefore reference should be checked.

*Answer: References were updated to AMP style.*

Do the citations actually contain the information described in the manuscript? - Yes

**Question 3**

Was any recent or relevant article omitted? – Yes.

*Answer: New references were added.*

Is the percentage of recent references adequate? – Yes.

Tables / Figures: Is the message clear enough so that any reference in the main text is

not necessary? Are they clearly identified and legible? Are all the abbreviations and

acronyms described in footnotes? Yes.

Acknowledgments:

Is any financial support declared? Are any conflicts of interest declared? – Authors

declare to don’t have any conflict of interest.

**Question 4**

EXTENSION: Can the manuscript be shortened without removing any crucial aspects?

Can any figures/tables be removed or improved? – Can Be.

*Answer: Manuscript and tables were changed and improved following indications of the reviewers.*

PRESENTATION: Is the manuscript clearly and logically presented? If not, can it be

improved? How? – Is clearly and logically presented.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PUBLICATION: Do you think the manuscript should

be published in AMP? Why? Why not?

- Can be published. Has a review add some value to our daily practice.

PRIORITY REGARDING PUBLICATION: In which ranking regarding priority in publication

would you consider the manuscript? Within the first 10%? – Not priority

Thanks.

Cláudia Vieira