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Neurocognitive function in bipolar disorder: a comparison between bipolar I and bipolar II disorder and matched controls.

This is a extremely well conceptualized and well written manuscript. It provided an important contribution to the field.

All of my revision suggestions are minor essential or discretionary revisions. I have only a couple of very minor comments. First, it is confusing on page 12 when current symptoms of mania are found to correlate with cognitive functioning when the authors stress in the abstract, method and discussion that the patients assessed are euthymic. It would be useful to clarify this. Some discussion of this issue is found on page 16.

Second, the conclusions are very strong suggesting that there are no differences in the bipolar I and II patient’s cognitive performance. While I agree with the general conclusions, one could argue that because in almost all cases patient’s with bipolar II disorder have intermediate performance (between the bipolar I and control participants) that it may be premature to rule out the hypothesis regarding a continuum. I wonder if factor derived summary scores of neurocognitive performance was obtained if the bipolar I and II patients might not have shown significant differences. As noted in the discussion the sample is sufficiently large to detect type II errors but that is based on a strategy in which all neurocognitive skills are assessed individually. Finally, while diagnostic procedures are well articulated and well conceived. It may be overstating the accuracy of the procedures in that no estimates of reliability were assessed within the context of the diagnostic procedures and the diagnosis relied on consensus. I do believe that the approached used was adequate but perhaps some discussion of this limitation is warranted.
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