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The Editor
BMC Journals
Biomed Central

8 October 2004

Dear Sir

Thank you for receiving this revised version of our manuscript that we believe has a addressed the questions raised by the reviewer.

All formating changes as listed have been made in the uploaded manuscript. In response to minor essential revisions suggested by the reviewer the following changes have been made:

1) The reviewer correctly points out that this sample draws on the work published by Seedat et al(2004). This was acknowledged in the background section of the paper, but is now also mentioned in the methods section as requested. The publication of this paper since original submission of this manuscript is reflected in the reference list.

2) The reviewer correctly noted inaccuracies in the tables. These inaccuracies all proved to be typographical and do not impact substantially on the regions of change or the discussion that is presented. For table 2: the co-ordinates 28, -8, 40 reflect a cluster not in brain grey matter. The correct co-ordinates should read 24, -28, 12 and this is in the tail of the right thalamus. In table 3, typographical errors in the brain region column have been corrected. Left inferior frontal.. should read Right inferior frontal. The region labels left prefrontal and right precuneus should be swopped around so that co-ordinates 8,-48,16 correspond to right precuneus and -28,60,-8 correspond to left prefrontal.

3) The limitation of the absence of an untreated control group is acknowledged and this is reflected in this section of the discussion.

Discretionary revisions:

4) The usefulness of the proposed analysis is acknowledged, however we have decided not to include this in this paper at this time.

We trust that these changes are now in order and anticipate your final comments.

Sincerely
Paul Carey
Corresponding author