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Reviewer's report:

The description of the methodology for the transcultural adaptation of the Pain Medication Questionnaire (PMQ) was very well done, easy to follow, and quite interesting. The descriptive information on item by item responses in the sickle cell patient sample was interesting and consistent with the pain characteristics seen in adults with this disorder who often experience repeated episodes of acute pain in addition to their ongoing chronic pain. Thus much of the interpretation provided in the discussion is likely incorrect and overestimates opioid misuse in this population, and should wait for a more detailed clinical validation.

Specific questions are as follows:

1. Page 5, line 52: How were these cutoffs determined or validated?

2. Page 18, line 16: There was a significant difference in the PMQ score between medium risk and very low/low and very high risk (Table 6). "-this information is not provided in Table 6?

3. Page 19, line 11: You should not infer the presence of psychiatric disorders on the basis of responses to several items in the PMQ.

4. Page 19, line 31: Early refills and increased doses are more likely related to the unpredictability of episodes of acute on chronic pain rather than non-compliance

5. Page 19, lines 33-37: Please be more specific about what you mean by "altered thinking processes" and how those are related to opioid usage

6. Page 19, line 59: Relationships between opioid abuse and insomnia are not obvious, and likely confounded by co-occurrence of chronic pain
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
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