**Reviewer 1:**

**Comments to the authors:**

The participants and methods should be described in more detail as follows:

**- to specify which age is included and whether participants of both genders are participating,**

Tables number 1 and 2 contain the required data. Please, pay attention at these tables.

**- to explain more clearly what are the criteria of inclusion and criteria of exclusion from the research for both groups, experimental and control (the description is unclear, what are the other health conditions, also what are the significant neurological conditions, whether the existence of CLBPS is simultaneously excluded in patients with DPL...)**

The inclusion criteria are listed in the text.

DPN - experimental group: patients with a definite diagnosis of DPN according to the criteria proposed by Dyck et al., diagnosis of definite NP according to criteria of Finnerup NB et al. and positive results for NP on all three NP questionnaires (PD-Q, LANSS, DN4).

DPN - control group: patients witt DPN who did not meet the criteria for NP according to Finnerup NB et al. and tested negative on all three NP questionnaires.

CLBPS - experimental group: patients with CLBPS, definite NP according to criteria of Finnerup NB et al. and tested positive for NP on all three NP questionnaires (PD-Q, LANSS, DN4).

CLBPS - control group: patients witt CLBPS who did not meet the criteria for NP according to Finnerup NB et al. and tested negative on all three NP questionnaires.

Patients who had both DPN and CLBPS were not included in the study.

**Exclusion criteria are supplemented in more detail:**

Exclusion criteria were significant neurological disease (stroke, dementia, severe dysphasia or dysarthria), major psychiatric disorder, cognitive impairment, other medical conditions (malignancy, heart failure, renal failure, liver failure, tuberculosis, limb amputation) history of alcohol abuse and use of psychotropic medications. A total of 20 patients with DPN and 14 patients with CLBPS were excluded from the study.

**- to specify which device, how many researchers, and which method was used in the Laboratory for electromyography to determine the existence of DPN and CLBPS, as well as what are the criteria for assessing the grading of the severity of CLBPS for both groups (experimental and control) and type of DPN.**

The requested explanation added in the text:

*Electromyography examination* (EMG) was performed by the single examiner on the Natus Nicolet EMG Machine (ZV). Motor and sensory nerves on the upper and lower extremities were examined. Using the needle electrode muscles were examined on both sides. Motor nerves (median, ulnar, peroneal and tibial), sensory nerves (median and sural) and muscles (extensor digitorum brevis, flexor hallucis brevis, tibialis anterior, gastrocnemius, vastus medialis and abductor pollicis brevis) were examined in patients with DPN. In patients with CLBPS, the same motor nerves, sensory nerves, and muscles in the lower extremities were examined as in patients with DPN. PN was defined as sensory, motor or sensorimotor according to the type of predominantly affected nerves, or according to the pathophysiological mechanism of nerve damage as axonal, demyelinating or axonal-demyelinating. Severity of radiculopathy according to EMG is assessed by the examiner during muscle contraction during examination with a needle electrode.

**- the bordering values of the questionnaire for NP are given, describe the criteria for the definitive NP according to the author and what are the definitive criteria for diagnosing DPN.**

An explanation of the required criteria added in the text:

These criteria are clear, but very long and complex. Potential readers can find them in references [3,10].

**- tables 1. and 2. do not show where the statistically significant difference exists in the examined parameters (there is one in the description below the table, but the parameters are not indicated in the table)**

The required parameters added in the tables 1 and 2.

**Reviewer 2:**

My suggestion is to add the following sentence to the conclusion: Due to its high sensitivity and comprehensive approach, DN4 could be recommended as a routine tool in diagnosing neuropathic pain in clinical practice, especially in patients with DPN, as well as in cases where NP is associated with radiculopathy.

The proposed text added to the conclusion:

Due to its high sensitivity and comprehensive approach, DN4 could be recommended as a routine tool in diagnosing neuropathic pain in clinical practice, especially in patients with DPN, as well as in cases where NP is associated with radiculopathy.