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Dear Editor,

Thank you for your re-review of our manuscript entitled Suicidal intention, psychosocial factors and referral to further treatment: A one-year cross-sectional study of self-poisoning. (MS: 4489331493024770).

Thank you for the recent review. We are grateful for the useful comments and suggestions for improvement.

We have tried to address all the comments from the reviewers, and a point-by-point description of the changes is included below. We have highlighted the changes in the manuscript by using “tracked changes”. We hope our manuscript now will be acceptable for publication in BMC Psychiatry.

Yours sincerely,

Mari Asphjell Bjornaas
MD, PhD
Department of Acute Medicine
Oslo University Hospital Ulleval
N-0407 Oslo
Norway

mabjornaas@gmail.com
Reviewer 1: Jess Fiedorowicz

Version: 2

Reviewer's report:

The authors have been highly responsive to previous review. Their rationale for maintaining terminology is acceptable. The paper is better organized and well-written. Important findings are highlighted.

Major compulsory revisions:
A1) Based on my calculations, the annual incidence should read 0.21% rather than 2.1% (page 6).
   MB: We had used the symbol ‰, meaning 1/1000. In order to avoid misunderstandings, we have changed the sentence, using percentages instead.

Minor essential revisions:
B1) Please consider changing “Informed consent was asked for” to “Informed consent was obtained.” Please also specify whether informed consent was written or verbal.
   MB: The changes have been made as suggested.

B2) The GHB abbreviation should be provided on page 5.
   MB: Done.

B3) Is the following statement in the discussion based on data presented?
   “Although both suicide attempt patients and appeal patients displayed aspects of suicidal behavior, the suicide attempt patients were probably in a deeper crisis at the time of admission.”
   If not, consider removing.
   MB: We have removed the statement.

Discretionary revisions:
C1) The discussion states the following “However, the main distinction between suicide attempt patients and appeal patients in this study was the suicidal intent, and the terms “moderate to high suicide intent” versus “low or no suicide intent” might have been used instead.”
   While I agree with this statement, which was provided in response to my concern about the term, the authors have already addressed the limitations of terminology and provided an adequate rationale to their use of the term. I wonder if this sentence could be worded to reconnect with their findings. Perhaps, something like “given the similarity between suicide attempt and appeal patients observed in our study, terminology may appropriately focus on the overall level of intent rather than the presumed motivation implied by terms such as gesture or appeal.” The authors can decide whether to retain, modify, or eliminate this sentence.
   MB: We have modified this sentence a bit, and included it in the paragraph.
Reviewer 2: Ahmad Ghanizadeh

Reviewer's report:
Accept without revision

MB: No further changes needed.