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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript for publication at BMC Psychiatry.

We have carefully read your comments and requests needed before proceeding with the assessment of our manuscript, which we have already addressed as follows:

Comment #1 Please move your funding information to the acknowledgement section

As requested, we have moved the sentence “The first author of this paper has been awarded with a PhD fellowship by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology - FCT (SFRH/BD/87308/2012)” from the Methods section to the Acknowledgements. As a consequence, we have also changed the title of the section “Ethics, data protection and financial support” to “Ethics and data protection”, considering that we removed all the information about funding from there.

Comment #2 Ethical and Funding Approval Documentation

We have all the documentation required to confirm the award of the PhD scholarship and the ethics approval. Regarding the former, we have prepared a PDF with the message sent by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) to the first author’s e-mail (paulagomesalves@hotmail.com) confirming the approval of the PhD scholarship for this project. This message was originally sent in a bilingual format, i.e. Portuguese / English, and thus it was not necessary to request a translated version of it. As for the latter, we have requested the Ethics Committee to translate the text confirming the approval of the project into English, given that the original document was written in Portuguese. All of these documents have already been sent to the BMCSeriesEditorial@biomedcentral.com as requested.
Comment #3 Executive Editor’s Comment

"With regards to the funding of your study, please clarify whether the funding body reviewed this study proposal specifically or whether they are funding the PhD as a whole. We would like to clarify whether this study has been reviewed by an external review board."

In FCT, the funding body that awarded the PhD scholarship for this project, funds PhD candidates on an individual basis, based on their academic achievements, conditions of the host institution(s) and the study proposal. To evaluate the study proposal, the work plan is peer-reviewed by a body of external examiners who are expert in the respective field of study (in this case, Psychology). The following paragraph from the funding approval document confirms this evaluation process:

“all applications have been evaluated by panels of experts from the different scientific areas. The panels scored each application based on the merit of the applicant as well as the work programme presented and the hosting conditions”.

Believing that we have successfully addressed all of your requests, we are looking forward to having your feedback about our manuscript.

We are very happy to provide further information if needed.

Kind regards,

Paula Alves