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Resubmission of revised article

Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team

Attached please find the revised article. The paper introduces a German short version of a questionnaire for the recalled parental rearing, discusses its psychometric characteristics, and validates it along the lines of life satisfaction and interpersonal problems. The instrument is especially useful for clinical and family research as well as for clinical practice.

An earlier version of the article was submitted in 10/2007 under the review number Ms-No: 8421314951667679 and rejected with the possibility for resubmission. Addressing all comments and suggestions of the reviewers, the article was significantly revised as follows.

To point 1:
Following the recommendation the introduction was shortened and focussed to the central point – a German short questionnaire for recalled parental rearing. The introduction ends with a short outline of the issues addressed in the following article. The description of the questionnaire was moved to the method section as recommended.

To point 2:
As recommended a statistical section was added. In this section the questions addressed with the respective statistical method and the hypothesized result are stated. Limitations of the design including those concerning the discriminant and convergent validity of the instrument are addressed in the discussion.

To point 3:
The statistical procedures were taken out of the result section and explained in detail in the statistical section. Also the gender and age differences were analysed by a multivariate analysis of variance as recommended.

To point 4:
In the descriptions of the questionnaires the score ranges of the scales were added. The percentages in the highest and lowest scores and the numbers of persons included in the calculation were added to the result section.

To point 5:
To specify the meaningfulness of the effects, effect sizes were added to the calculations in order to rule out the effect of the large sample size.
To point 6:
The reviewer highlighted accurately that factor loadings between 0.25-0.30 are indeed difficult to interpret. The interpretations of the analyses follows common use. Only factor loadings over .40 are interpreted. No more than three items 10, 11 and 19 have an additional factor loading higher than .25. A similar factorial structure of the questionnaire as presented in the paper has already been replicated in several studies (Arrindell & van der Ende, 1984). Additionally, in the discussion the significant but low correlation coefficients are now addressed.

To point 7:
The discussion was adapted to the suggest structure and now addressess the limitations of points 2 and 6.

To point 8:
The cohort presented in this paper is a representative sample for the German population. Representative samples are usually used to validate instruments and the results based on a German representative sample are generalizable for German cohorts. However, the results are not generalizable for specific cohorts as psychosomatic patients or persons older than ours (>70). In such specific samples it cannot be ruled out that cohorts with specific properties may lead to different results.

To point 9:
The tables now show the number of persons added into the different calculations.

I confirm that this manuscript has not been previously published and has not been nor will be submitted elsewhere during the review process.

Sincerely,

Katja Petrowski