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General
Dear editor

Thank you very much for giving me the chance to review the above paper.

Although the publication of similar studies is of interest for a limited number of colleagues, my personal opinion is that they should be published in international journals because they constitute a rare transcultural treasure which otherwise remains difficult to access.

Concerning the study itself, I recommend resubmission de-novo after major revision.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Abstract: It is poorly written and does not include any data
Introduction: We need a better description of the instrument (eg number of items, scoring etc)
The authors use sometimes the word ‘structure’ and other times ‘semi-structure’. It is not the same thing.
Material and methods:
Did the authors asked and obtained permission by those developed the interview?
Which are the prerequisites for someone to be considered as suitable to apply the instrument?
The authors did not report any particular problems they faced with the translation process. The phrase ‘almost the same meaning’ is problematic
The demographic characteristics of the sample must be included in the methods (subjects), not in the results
Was the interview applied by a medical student (undergraduate?). This is not acceptable and if so, may constitute a reason to simply reject the whole study. This kind of interviews are for specially trained interviewers.
The statistical analysis is not adequate.
According to the text, test-retest was tested in 11 subjects and inter-rater reliability in 14. These numbers are inadequate. In this frame, the tables are misleading and as shown in table 2, 2 out of 3 disorders have no temporal diagnostic stability.
Table 4 refers to sensitivity, specificity etc. of a semi-structured interview applied by a student against a free clinical diagnosis by an expert. I am not sure if this is inside the scope of the particular paper.
The second paragraph of the discussion is a perfect reflection of my objections to the appropriateness of the design of the study.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Conclusively, I consider that the study can not be accepted in its current form. It needs major revision and after it, should be resend for de-novo review

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes

Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests'