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Associate Editor comments for MS: 1446950313878835:

"This paper seems to have received the attention and modifications required by the reviewers. Before publication, I would prefer that what the authors call the predictive validity of the DUNDRUM1, would be discussed and eventually rephrased. For prediction usually it is intended an information concerning the future, and traditionally, predictive validity for a psychological measure is something which informs about the specific outcomes that will happen after a time interval from the moment when the measure was taken. In our case, I don't see any prediction in this sense. What they have found is a good concomitant validity (which could be called validity with no other qualifications) between the DUNDRUM1 and the way that usually the placement decision is taken in Ireland for those people. In the paper there is no information about outcomes in order to justify the term prediction."

We have now deleted or changed the word 'predictive' at every point where it occurs, in the title and elsewhere in the manuscript.

"Another thing which could be suggested before publication is a streamlining of the paper aimed to a more concise and up to the point format of the text."

We have re-edited the text, in particular the Discussion, making the separate sections more concise and distinct. We have been particularly careful to ensure that there is an absolute minimum of overlap between this paper and the related manuscript MS: 1712852154387888. It is easier to do this now than it was when both were first submitted.

"Most of the tables and figures are redundant and repetitions of what is already detailed in the text. Furthermore, in most cases one of the two components (text and/or tables) could be avoided."

We have carefully re-read to ensure that there is no unnecessary overlap between the text of the results section and the tables. One of the great advantages of the web publication format is the capacity to place all relevant tables before the critical reader. The reviewers appear to have appreciated this, as we do also.

"My final comment; I have the impression that these people are mixing two concepts, the DUNDRUM Manual (including # 1, 2, 3 etc.) and a scientific paper informing on the essential characteristics of the DUNDRUM."

We are grateful to the associate editor for this insight. We are particularly conscious of the need to distinguish between the handbook and the validation studies. This and the related paper (MS: 1712852154387888) contain essential validation data testing the hypotheses that arise from the need to establish the validation of such research and clinical instruments.