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Reviewer's report:

In my last review I was critical on the single item instrument to measure interference with pain. In this version of the manuscript, the authors agree with the simplicity of the instrument and write a sentence about the simple measurement of pain interference in the discussion paragraph. I think the single item instrument is not formally validated. As a method for validation, the authors calculated mean pain intensity in patients who stated interference with pain and in patients without pain interference. Mean pain intensity indeed differed.

I also requested a definition for the term sensitivity and specificity. I understood that the PI was considered as the gold standard. However, the definitions as given in the paragraph on the data analysis are not correct. The sensitivity is the percentage of patients with pain interference who actually score under the cut-off using the PMI. The definition of specificity also does not suffice. I ask the investigators to change the definitions in formal ones. According to the results, I think the investigators calculated sensitivity and specificity properly.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess
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.
I am able to assess the statistics

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