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* Cover Letter

Oslo July 1st 2013

The Editor,
BMC Psychiatry

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your e-mail and the possibility to resubmit a second revision of MS: 7899180259511766 “Clinical characteristics in schizophrenia patients with or without suicide attempts and non-suicidal self-harm - a cross-sectional study.” We respond to the reviewer’s comments in the following section. Revised versions of the manuscript and tables are uploaded according to your instructions.

Reviewer 1

Reviewer's report

Version: 2 Date: 12 June 2013

Reviewer: Christopher Gale

Reviewer's report:
I have reviewed the paper and read the letter from the authors, taking into account the comments from the other reviewer. The authors have done a careful revision, paid attention to the points raised, and I have no further concerns. This paper should be accepted.

Reply, reviewer’s report
We thank the reviewer for his comments to the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 2

Version: 2 Date: 20 June 2013
Reviewer: Graham Pluck
Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Reviewer 2, comment 1. I previously recommended that some planned contrasts / post-hoc comparisons be reported in tables 1 and 2. The authors have seemingly done this. The tables now have a final column that includes some information on which groups differed from which groups. However, I feel this could still be made clearer. I assume that where, for example, you have put 1<3, this means that group 1 was significantly lower than group 2 at the p=.05 level. If so, something should be added...
to the tables to provide some information to the reader to confirm this. Perhaps a footnote to say that these are the post hoc comparisons that were statistically significant. Alternatively, you could add *, **, *** etc to each paired comparison.

Reply, comment 1
To make clearer what the last column in Tables 1 and 2 represent, we have provided the information that only statistically significant differences are presented (in footnote e in both tables). In addition, we have included information about the numbering of groups in the same footnote.

Revisions, comment 1
Tables 1 and 2: Footnote e changed into the following: “Planned pairwise comparisons of Group 1 (SA+NSSH) vs Group 2 (SA only) and Group 1 (SA+NSSH) vs Group 3 (NoSA) (Scheffe’s test, Pearson chi square test, Mann–Whitney U test). Only statistically significant differences (p<.05) presented.”

Discretionary Revisions

Reviewer 2, comment 2. Page 6, the SCID-I should be referenced.

Reply, comment 2
The reference to the SCID I is now included.

Revision, comment 2
Methods section, Clinical assessments, 2nd sentence: The following reference is included in text and reference list:

Reviewer 2, comment 3. Page 10, last part of the paragraph, 'Current symptoms and behaviors', I note that two of the chi2 calculations have identical values (x2=0.3, DF=1, p=0.583). This may be a coincidence but it is worth checking in case an error has been made.

Reply, comment 3
We have checked and re-run the analyses and the values reported are correct. In other words, the identical values are in fact a coincidence.

Reviewer 2, comment 4. Page 12, 11th line, 'were' not 'was'.

Reply, comment 4
We have corrected the sentence according to the suggestion from the reviewer.

Revision, comment 4
Discussion section, page 12, 11th line, first part of sentence changed to: “The NSSH behaviors reported in the current study usually carried little death risk, were often highly repetitive,”

We look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,
Erlend Mork
Researcher/Cand. Psychol.
National Centre for Suicide Research and Prevention
Institute of Clinical Medicine
University of Oslo