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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is generally well written and organized. The primary issue with the paper is addressed in the compulsory section.

I was pleased to review the paper entitled, "Prospective study of factors influencing conditional discharge from a forensic hospital: The DUNDRUM-3 programme completion and DUNDRUM-4 recovery and structured professional judgment instruments and risk.” This is a re-review, and I was privileged to read the initial submission of this paper. Overall, the authors were receptive to the reviews and their work is evidenced in a much improved paper. There are still some issues that need to be addressed:

1. In describing diagnoses, the authors appear to use several that are not official diagnoses. For instance, psychotic depression would appear to be Major Depression with Psychotic Features.

2. My primary concern remains with the outcomes and potential confounds with the independent variables. The fact that these outcomes are not independent is a primary concern. More to the point, it is my opinion the authors still have not properly addressed this confound. And, this is underscored by logistic regressions predicting 95.1% of the outcomes. This pattern is repeated throughout the logistic regressions. The fact the variables are so intertwined limits the study to a significant degree.

3. The first paragraph in the limitations section is highly confusing. I understand you are talking about different populations but the fact is the MHRBs were not blinded to the instruments, and that means this study is not predictive. Based on this limitation, it is my opinion these results should not be presented.
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