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Covering letter

Dear Editors,

Re: The prediction of discharge from in-patient psychiatric rehabilitation: a case control-study.

Thank you very much for reviewing my manuscript. I have revised the manuscript in response to the very helpful points highlighted by the reviewers. I have listed my responses to the points made by the reviewers below.

1. That the process of high dependency rehabilitation and longer term complex care should be defined.
   I agree that an understanding of these concepts is very important for the reader and have added three sentences under the setting heading of the methods section to describe these processes in greater detail.

2. That the findings make the case for specialised forensic rehabilitation services.
   The findings do highlight the growing need for secure longer term in-patient rehabilitation with high staff to patient ratios and access to a wide variety of therapeutic interventions. I have added to the conclusions section to make this point.

3. There was no real description of statistical analysis.
   I have added a subheading for statistical analysis in the methods section and revised what was written on the tests used and their rationale to make this clearer.

4. That how patients were selected was not reported.
   I have re-arranged the methods section, bringing the description of the sample closer to the beginning of the section and using subheadings to make the description of the sample more accessible.

5. Three papers were recommended as citations for the paper.
   I have cited one of the recommended articles in the paper (reference number 21). The two other papers that were recommended to be cited were out-with the scope of this paper: one as the subjects of the paper were nursing staff and the other as the setting was accident and emergency departments rather than rehabilitation services.

In response to the editorial requests I have revised the abstract and made the ethical approval section more accessible again by using a subheading in the methods section.

Thank you very much again for all of your help so far with this paper.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Joanna Bredski