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Dear BioMed Central Editorial Team,

attached please find the revised article. The paper introduces a short version of a questionnaire in German 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 and 05/2008 (Ms-No: 8421314951667679) and rejected with the possibility for resubmission. Addressing all comments and suggestions of the reviewers, the article was significantly revised, especially in the following points:

Point 1: The reviewer commented: The main purposes of this study are still not so clear. Did the authors developed a shorter version? or have they adapted a previous short developed version? The objectives of the study should be better stated as follows: "The objectives of the present study were....". The purpose of the study is specified on page 5, line 12. The objectives of the study are stated on page 5 in the last two paragraphs.

Point 2: The reviewer commented: Similarly, how the authors started and decided which items to be included in the short version? Was it based on a previous existing short version? In other case, the process of item selection should be detailed in the present manuscript. To increase readability, we have incorporated a concise description of the short version and the process of the item selection on page 6 in the last paragraph. Since these aspects are published elsewhere, we refer the reader to this publication for further details.

Point 3: The reviewer commented: The analysis they carried out included internal consistency reliability, and construct validity. It would be good to define the latter and to clearly state on how it was assessed. The analyses of the internal consistency are now provided and discussed on page 8 starting from line 18. The construct validity is addressed on page 9 in the last paragraph.

Point 4: The reviewer commented: Although they expect to find similar psychometric properties than in the original version (i.e. last para in the introduction section) no formal comparisons
with the original version are presented.
A formal comparison of long and short versions in a representative sample is part of the future work. This now is clearly stated in Section “limitations” on page 15 in line 9. However, this comparison was examined in a small sample after the short version was developed and published in Schumacher (2002).

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