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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper is much improved and I commend the authors for their responses to the prior reviews. The longer time period of follow up has also benefited the study. My comments are now minor.

Major compulsory revisions: nil

Minor essential revisions: The study is of 56 eligible patients. Figure 1 is unnecessary, as is much of the first para, page 8.

Discretionary revisions: If I have read the paper accurately, this is a study of 56 patients each experiencing 3 reviews by the MHRB, for a total of 168 decision points. The authors have used measures [the DUNDRUM and other tools] taken in Feb-March 2011 to predict release by December 2012, yet some of the tools are dynamic and may well have changed between the first and third MHRB hearings, for instance. Could the authors comment on the amount of change that the DUNDRUM 3 and 4, and indeed the dynamic components of the other measures might have taken place of over this time period, and whether that has any influence on the predictive power of measures possibly taken 18 months prior to the final release opportunity?

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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