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Dear Editor

MS: 1806240907830660

We hereby submit the revised manuscript: “Health Service Costs and Clinical Gains in Psychotherapy for Personality Disorders: A randomized controlled Trial of Day Hospital-based Step-down Treatment versus Outpatient Treatment in Specialist Practice” by authors Elfrida Hartveit Kvarstein, Espen Ajo Arnevik, Vidar Hallsteinli, Frida Gullesstad Rø, Sigmund Karterud, and Theresa Wilberg.

We thank the editor and reviewers for interest and comments. In accordance with both reviewers we have thoroughly revised the manuscript in order to improve language, flow and clarity. The introduction and discussion have been shortened, the results section reorganized in accordance with reviewer recommendations and tables revised and reorganized. We have also explained in more detail about use of mixed model statistics and investigations of possible bias by attrition.

We now hope now that our message comes more clearly through.

We find that the PD subgroup analyses are a central aspect of our study as the two subgroups dominate the sample and have contrasting outcomes. It would therefore be misleading not to emphasize this factor in our report. The revised text aimed to clarify numbers better as we understand that our first version was misleading on this point. Avoidant PD was diagnosed for 44 patients (40%) and borderline PD for 51 patients (46%). Their distribution in the two compared treatment conditions is reported in Table 1. Moderator analyses, estimated costs and all statistical inferences are based on all patients and control for the separate impacts of comorbidity.

We would appreciate consideration of the revised manuscript for publication in BMC Psychiatry

Kind regards,
on behalf of all coauthors,

Elfrida Hartveit Kvarstein
Sigmund Karterud

Research Group at the Department for Personality Psychiatry, Oslo University Hospital, Kirkeveien 166, 0407 Oslo, Norway