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Reviewer’s report:

Prof Paul Lysaker
BMC Psychiatry,

Dear Prof Lysaker,

Thank you for sending me the paper entitled “Depressive Symptoms in First Episode Psychosis: A One-Year Follow-Up Study” to review. This is an interesting and important paper that has clinical implications and contributes to the understanding of depressive symptoms in psychosis. Below please find few comments for the improvement of the paper:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1- The end of the introduction – the description of instrument and participants should be integrated to the method section.

2- At the end of the introduction the authors spell out 4 questions. The first one seems a bit vogue and clarification would be beneficial. Also- can these questions be translated into research hypotheses? It seems that the literature review in the introduction support direction of hypotheses.

3- Please provide reasons for dropouts between the two measures.

4- The method needs re-editing: the instruments are described all together in the instrument section and their reliability in the procedure section. At the end of the instruments section there is a sentence that would be better placed in the procedure.

5- In the statistical analysis section – 4 groups are mentioned. What four groups? Only in the results, later on, these are mentioned.

6- Also – in the analysis section – it is written that the order of entering to the regression was dependent on the correlational analysis. And then the variables in the regression are presented without referring to the correlations. It seems to contradict- please clarify.

7- In the results section it is written:” The course of depressive symptoms during the 12 months period followed four different pathways:…". Please provide explanation as to what analysis was conducted to reach these four pathways. What cut-off or cluster analysis was preformed?
8- Table 4: is it a B or Beta?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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