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General
The ms “The psychometric properties of Kiddie-schedule for affective disorders and schizophrenia- present and lifetime version- Farsi Version” is a comparison of child and adolescent psychiatric diagnoses generated in a K-SADS-PL- interview and a clinical interview. The sample consisted of 96 outpatients and 13 normal control subjects aged 4-19 years. Consensual validity of all diagnosed disorders was found good, test-retest and inter-rater reliability were good. Sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive validity were acceptable for most diagnoses.

Psychometric studies on diagnostic interviews in different cultures are clearly needed. The ms is another study in the field and serves possible future international comparisons of child and adolescent psychiatric disorders. However, I have some comments the authors may wish to consider.

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

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

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

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

1) A description of an approval of an ethical board should be provided.
2) Table 1 shows that no psychotic disorders or substance use disorders were diagnosed, which probably is a consequence of the referral procedure to the study site. Therefore, a description of the clinic and the referral procedure is needed.
3) The KSADS-PL – interview is semi-structured, requiring clinical decision-making. It was planned to be used by trained clinicians. So why did the authors use a “lay interviewer” in the KSADS-PL – interview?
4) A more thorough description of the translation and back translation procedure would be informative.
5) How were the normal controls enrolled?
6) How many outpatients and normal controls were in the sub-samples for inter-rater and test re-test reliability?
7) The results section should include a brief description of the main findings in tables 1-4.
8) The discussion section deals mainly with methodological aspects of the study. It should more comprehensively discuss of the main findings and compare the findings with previous published psychometric research on the instrument. E.g. a table comparing the present and previous studies might be helpful.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

9) There are some minor typo errors and linguistic errors which need to be corrected.
**What next?**: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

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

**Statistical review**: No

**Declaration of competing interests**: I declare that I have no competing interests.