

1. Basic reporting

Major points:

1. The authors tested pain-related somatosensory attention by assessing N120 and P220 as the neural signature of such process. And specific hypotheses are built upon it. However, the mechanistic interpretation of these two components underlying this assumption is missing. This should be discussed before introducing specific hypothesis in the introduction section. (Line 113-124) For example, what's the mechanistic implication of N120 and P220?
2. The hypothesis described in the introduction (Line 117-124) and Data analyses (Line 346-363) are mismatched as shown below. Mismatched hypotheses are marked in red. I encourage the author to go through the rest of the paper since mislabeling occurred elsewhere.

In the Introduction section,

This would be reflected by 1.a) a larger N120 in the pain-relevant location in the threat movements as compared to neutral movements and 1.b) a location unspecific enhancement of the P200 component for threat movements compared to neutral movements. Furthermore, we expected the nonpain motor goal pursuit to inhibit pain- related somatosensory attention as reflected by 2.a) a smaller N120 component in the pain-relevant location in the conflicting movements as compared to threat movements and 2.b) a location unspecific reduction of the P200 component for conflicting movements compared to threat movements.

In the Data analysis section,

To test whether the threat of pain (hypothesis 1.a) or nonpain motor goal pursuit (hypothesis 1.b) modulates pain-related somatosensory attention (operationalized as the amplitude of the N120 component elicited by the tactile stimuli at the pain-relevant location),
Similarly, to test whether the threat of pain (hypothesis 2.a) or nonpain motor goal pursuit (hypothesis 2.b) modulates pain-related somatosensory attention (operationalized as the amplitude of the P200 component elicited by the tactile stimuli regardless of the location)

3. The author found insignificant modulation of movement types on N120 while significant modulation on P200. The possible physiological interpretation is missing.

Minor points:

1. The items inside the computer monitor are blurred in the figure 1. I suggest showing the screenshot of each task epoch as it's alone. Appropriate labeling of each item on the screen could be helpful for explaining the task procedure.
2. Table 1: It should be threat condition instead of Negative condition
3. Line 108: the word 'suprising' is too emotional.

2. Experimental design

1. The author needs to justify the basis of identifying SEP components only based on a specific set of electrodes (N120 on Fz, Fc1, Fc2 and Cz; P200 on Cz Fc1, Fc2, Cp2 and Cp1), either through literature reference or statistical analyses. Moreover, the procedure of the ROI selection was not mentioned.
Line 334-339