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Reviewer's report:

Language: The manuscript needs to be thoroughly revised for grammatical errors.

Sample: how do they know the residents are similar in terms of economic and educational levels. How do they define severity of flood? Who defines %50, %75 etc.?

How many interviewers? How long did assessment take? How long did data collection last? How were the subjects contacted? Where were they interviewed? Any privacy problems? How many refused? What was done to find those who were not at home during the visit? How were the missing data completed, by re-visits or by phone?

On page 5, the authors should make it clear they are describing their questionnaire, not DSM-IV criteria. And what is a ?structured? questionnaire? Is it administered by interviewers? Did responders fill it themselves? Or was it read out to them and responses recorded? It is not necessary to give the 17 symptoms in detail. How was duration of symptom ascertained? Did interviewers ask about it for every positive item?

What is the reason for including items 13-16 among the predictors? Why isn?t loss of property or financial/material damage included?

Why is there no information about the trauma experiences of the sample? How many dead, injured etc.. What about the subjective experience (i.e fear ) during the flood.

Results: The authors state that the two groups were almost the same in terms of study measures. Does this mean the differences were not significant? There is no mention of this in the text or in the table.

It is not clear from the text, where the cutoff value comes from. Is it derived from a total score? If not, what is the practical use? How can any other researcher make use of it?

The authors state in discussion that ?all data were collected by blind method?. How is this possible, and why is it necessary?

Specific questions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Y
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? N
3. Are the data sound? DK
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Y
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? N
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? N
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Y
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Y
9. Is the writing acceptable N