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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Sir, Madam,

You'll find here enclosed the revised version of my manuscript entitled “Course of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and health care utilisation among resettled refugees in the Netherlands” (MS: 1476753329102087).

This new version has also been edited by a professional native speaker, upon the recommendation of the Editor and the Reviewer. You'll find here below a point-by-point description of the changes as compared with the previous version, preceded by the Reviewer's comments.

We hope you'll find it suitable for publication.

Best regards,

Majda Lamkaddem.

Reviewer's comment and changes

Page 7.

I still think you should include a brief report on the psychometric properties of the Harvard Trauma Questionnaire or at least direct readers to where they can find the relevant information.

For clarity purpose, we chose to refer to the study design article, where the both choice for coding and the items of the HTQ are being described. Therefore, we added the following sentence: “For more details on the HTQ items and the motivation for coding answer categories, see the study design paper of the first wave of the study by Gerritsen et al. [26].”

I also recommend that you specify how much of a change constituted an ‘improvement’ or ‘deterioration’. In other words what was the minimum change score from T1 to T2 to qualify as improvement/deterioration, 1 point, 2 points?
You need to make this explicit.

We added this description as required. The paragraph was modified: Scores < 0 were considered as a deterioration, scores > 0 as an improvement. Scores = 0 were coded as ‘no change’. For the multivariate analyses, this information was dichotomised as 1 = improvement in PTSD score between T1 and T2, and 0 = deterioration in PTSD score between T1 and T2. The ‘no change’ option rarely occurred at individual level; such cases were left out of the multivariate models.

Page 8:
[...] I recommend including the above explanation in the text of your manuscript, either in the methods section or the limitations section {about scale properties of the Living Difficulties items}

We referred to the studies where those items showed to be a scale, and mentioned this on p. 8. : “All items were considered to form a scale as shown in previous studies [29, 31].”

Page 10 and throughout the text.
I suggest using the words ‘study sample’ rather than ‘study population’

This change has been made throughout the text.

First paragraph – when you report p-values, can you also report the test statistic (I’m assuming it is chi-squared test). Also It would be advisable to explain why you did not do a typical non-response analysis as you have explained in your comments back to me.

We explained in the method section that we used Chi-squared statistics. We left the part explaining why we did not make a classical non-response analyse, because we had the idea that this information was quite detailed for an article which is already quite lengthy. This is a practical choice, we agree with the idea of the Reviewer.

Page 12, second paragraph:
‘was negatively related’

This change has been made (thank you).

Analysis section:
Use of verb tense is still inconsistent. Please edit carefully
All verb tenses were adapted with the help of the native speaker.