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Reviewer’s report:

General
The idea that siblings of probands with schizophrenia may have a higher prevalence of is very old news. The idea that registry information cannot detect nonpsychosis among siblings is perhaps more interesting.

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

The statistical methods that you used, logistic regression requires as a basic assumption, independent observations. Since multiple probands and multiple siblings came from the same family these observations are not independent. Actually, even the most basic analysis methods (e.g., chi-square and t-tests) have the same underlying assumption. Thus, the procedure you used is inappropriate and you will need to account for the familial relationships among the siblings.

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

This rule for selecting a sibling seems a bit vague, " However, for each proband we aimed to interview at least one sibling nearest in age to the proband and, if possible, of the same sex." I could see if the nearest in age siblings were fraternal twins, picking the same sex, but otherwise this rule is hard to follow.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The term "controls" is often reserved for more experimental studies. Using "comparison" group might be more descriptive for this manuscript.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes
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