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**Reviewer's report:**

Review comments

The authors are congratulated on the good job they did on the revision of the manuscript. The extensive commentary addressing the issues raised in the review of the first draft was well organized and supported by good arguments. The authors were able to successfully bring their point across on their reasoning about the value of including certain aspects of their study. In addition, they attended well to many of the suggestions made for improvement of the manuscript and the general comments about the focus and clarity of the manuscript were dealt with appropriately. Only some minor punctuation details remain which the authors or an editor could attend to if deemed necessary. The manuscript is well written and presents a well executed study. It should be of interest to a brought range of health care professionals. I recommend accepting the manuscript for publication in BMC Psychiatry.

Discretionary revisions

The punctuation issue has been well attended to; a few very minor details remain which an editor may go over carefully if deemed important by the authors. Some suggestions:

- Consistent use of empty lines between paragraphs, for example between the paragraphs ‘Validity of measures’ and ‘Outcome measures’ there should not be one?

- Use of spaces around the ‘=’ sign throughout the results section, for example in the ‘Prospective study of violence and self harm’ paragraph: sometimes there are spaces around the =, sometimes only on one side, sometimes none: ‘AUC=0.812’ vs. ‘AUC= 0.847’

Same for the letter abbreviations in the ‘Internal consistency’ paragraph: ‘(C )’ vs. ‘(F)’.

- Use of commas (no apostrophe) in the results section, for example the paragraph ‘Inter-rater reliability of new measures START and SAPROF’ (and
also the paragraph on ‘Construct validity’):
‘r = 0.829, p<0.001’ vs. ‘r = 0.694 p<0.001’

-Use of spaces, periods and commas in References section, for example:
  3. end with period.
  5. comma after ‘Health,’
  6. ‘1372- 1379’
  7. end with period and period after ‘Szmuckler.’
  14. & 15. outline to the left
     space between 42. & 43.
  47. & 48. Robbé with accent (also in text)

-Tables:
  Headers of Tables 3-11 in the same font as the headers of Tables 1 & 2
  All headers in bold (3,4,11)?
Sub-headers same font and line-spacing (see for example difference between
sub-headers Table 4 and Table 5).

**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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