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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Title:
In the title authors say “Validation of a Suicide Risk Screening Tool”. In the results they say “Results showed acceptable proprieties for self-harm prediction”. Even if evidence show that “Past and repeated self-harm were long-term risks to completed suicide [8-10]” It would be appropriate to change the title according to results.

Background:
- Existing Scales to assess the risk of suicide should be briefly described
- The original version of the SPS [ref 25] should be described (self report or interview, number of items, data of its role in predicting self harm or suicide attempts etc..)

Methods:
- The language validation (translation by independent researchers, back translation etc.) should be described
- In the paragraph "The Chinese version of SPS" the sensitivity and the specificity of the scale should be moved to the “results”.
- Are the PSIS, the BSSI and the BHS validated in Chinese? Authors should explain it, reporting here their Internal consistency (Cronbach alfa).

Data Analysis
- I suggest to evaluate the ability of the scales to predict self harm through the regression analysis, as It has been previously done (ref 22)

Results:
- I would suggest to explain better why authors have not calculated the Internal Consistency of the CSPS. Is this calculated in the original version of the SPS?

Comment:
The article has an importance in its field.
I would generally suggest to double check how the procedure is presented to make it easier for readers.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.