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PDF covering letter
Dear sir

We send you the revised manuscript of the study: 'Reliability, validity and psychometric properties of the Greek translation of the Major Depression Inventory' by Fountoulakis et al for judgment and possible publication in the BMC Psychiatry. The manuscript has been revised according to the comments of reviewers. Apart from table 3 (which has been uploaded as a separate file –bmp because it includes greek fonts which may be difficult to show correctly in the web) all other tables were included at the end of the manuscript so as to be included inside the text in the HTML format.

Concerning the remarks made by Dr Bandleow

1. There is a short description of the scale in the second paragraph of the ‘background’ and the complete scale is included in table 3.
2. Spearman coefficients replaced Pearson’s. The results were the same.
3. The factors reported now concern both before and after the rotation. There results are more or less the same.
4. The ROC analysis was deleted according to the other two reviewers’ comments
5. Spelling for ‘Cronbach’s’ was corrected throughout the text
6. In the Discussion it is now mentioned that the validation of the scale is not yet complete, that further research in larger samples is necessary etc
7. Fortunately there were data available from CES-D and ZDRS, which had been applied at the same time with MDI. Correlation results are now reported as well.
8. It is stated in the 8th paragraph of the ‘discussion’ that today scales do not serve as a diagnostic tool but are rather as an instrument to measure severity.
9. The language has been corrected by a person whose English is her native language.

Concerning the remarks made by Dr Furukawa

10. Both ways of scoring are mentioned in the ‘background’
11. The comments on the reliability and validity and the value of the MDI are now much more moderate.
12. A brief note on the BDI-2 and IDD is made.
13. The plus-minus sign refers to Mean ± standard deviation, and this is now stated in the text
14. The phrase ‘24pts vs 6’ has been replaced with a more descriptive phrase
15. Sn and Sp are now expressed as 0.xx throughout the text
16. Typos were corrected by a person whose native language is English
17. More details are given concerning translation and back translation
18. Spearman coefficients were used, as suggested by another referee
19. The problem of spectrum bias is briefly discussed
20. ROC analysis was deleted according to the comments by another referee

Concerning the remarks made by Dr Iverson

21. The comments on the reliability and validity and the value of the MDI are now much more moderate.
22. The meaning of 26/27 as the cut-off score is explained
23. The background section has been substantially revised
24. Comments on the limitations of test-retest and the factor analysis were added at the end of the discussion
25. Problems concerning the ‘gold standard’ were added in the ‘methods’ section
26. Factor analysis results are reported both before and after rotation. They are pretty much the same.
27. Figure 2 and ROC analysis were deleted
28. The language has been corrected by a person whose English is her native language.

Thessaloniki November 9, 2002

Best regards

Dr KN Fountoulakis