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Reviewer's report:


Overall I am pleased with the author’s revisions and applaud their efforts. I have only a few minor additional revisions (below) and some recommendations for them to consider regarding their future research. In line with BioMed’s explicit request, I have also responded to each of the template questions.

Minor Style Issues

On page 11, please change: "...since the scale showed a two-factor structure and this is not confirms to the theoretical basis for the BFNE..." to "...since the scale showed a two-factor structure and this does not conform to the..."

There are still instances wherein the authors are inconsistent about using a zero before a decimal place (e.g., 0.90 should be presented as .90). Please change all 0.## to .##.

Additional Comments

I recommend that in their next assessment the authors collaborate with someone who can add a CFA to support their research efforts. I also noted from the other reviewer that the possibility of an ROC was precluded because of challenges associated with the SIAS. The authors may find the following reference of help — and I would encourage them to consider translating and confirming the Social Interaction Phobia Scale (SIPS; Carleton et al., 2009) into Iranian for further research. I look forward to the translated BFNE-II and wish the authors the best of luck.
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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   a. Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   a. Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   a. Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   a. Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   a. Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   a. Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   a. Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   a. Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   a. The writing may still require moderate levels of editorial work, depending on BioMed’s requirements, before it can be presented – keeping in mind that this is to be expected given that the author’s first language is different from the language in which they are presenting.