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Reviewer's report:
I reviewed your article again. I request you following reconsideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers’ Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In response to my question, you showed us a model of confirmatory factor analysis. You should describe why you chose different models between SCL-90-R and its short version. In short version, you’re assuming the covariance of all pairs of subscales. In SCL-90-R, you chose different model. For example, somatization factor was assumed covariance with only ZWAN factor. This different modeling would read heterogeneous results. Please show the logical reason of that in your article.</td>
<td>This must be a misunderstanding. The covariance of the subscales of the SCL-90-R is depicted on page 2 of the PDF-document, unfortunately not on page 1. We certainly assume the covariance of all pairs of subscales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Page 11, Line2) You described “construct-unrelated scales”. Would you say that there is no relationship between depressive symptoms and non-depressive symptoms of SCL-90-R and short versions? In fact, you assumed correlations in confirmatory factor analysis between depression and other symptoms. There are conflicting statements in this paper.</td>
<td>Many thanks to this worthwhile comment. We corrected our statement within the manuscript (on the top of page 10). We totally agree with you that the subscales of the SCL are not uncorrelated; therefore we assume correlations between the scales within the confirmatory factor analysis. Therefore we stated that theoretically expected low correlation were not found, but only for the SCL-14 and the BSI-18 we found lower correlations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Page 7, Line 20) You described “neither significantly differ from nor correlate highly with the scale and …. of SCL-90-R long version.” Do you expect low correlation between short versions and long version?</td>
<td>We corrected that and inserted now “on the one and on the other hand” (see page 7, line 20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Page 10, Line 6 of 3.4 convergent and discriminant…) with the BDI total score (r=0.71). Properly is 0.77.</td>
<td>We corrected that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Page 11, Line 3 of 3.5 Sensitivity to change…) the effect sizes ranged between d=0.52 for the SCL-27 and d=0.67 for the BSI and BSI-18. Effect size of SCL-14 is 0.68 and larger.</td>
<td>We agree with you and corrected that accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>