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Reviewer's report:

The authors aim to proof that the PMI index is not always appropriate to evaluate the adequacy of pain management. This is a nice idea. I think a lot of investigators question whether the pain management index is appropriate for the evaluation of pain treatment. The authors succeeded to include a large number of people. However, They used a single item instrument for the evaluation of perceived interference with pain. This instrument is not well known and therefore cannot be considered as a gold standard for the assessment of pain interference with daily activities. Because I do not have access to the paper referred to, I cannot check whether the single item instrument has been validated for its psychometric characteristics. Information on the psychometric characteristics should be summarized in this manuscript. The authors had better used the BPI for the evaluation of pain interfering with daily activities. This instrument has been validated worldwide for its use in cancer-related pain.

In the discussion the authors comment on the use of the single item instrument. However, the comment is rather short and does not reflect a clear scientific insight in the limitations of using this instrument. I like to ask a more balanced discussion on the use of the single-item instrument.

I also would advise to better define the terms sensitivity and specificity in the methods section. The definitions given are not complete.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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