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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We again thank the reviewer for her scrutiny in reviewing our revised manuscript The performance of the K10, K6 and GHQ-12 to screen for present state DSM-IV disorders among disability claimants. We have adapted the manuscript following her recommendations. In the revised manuscript, added and omitted text is indicated by Track Changes.

As you recommended in your email, we have also added an Acknowledgements section. We believe that the manuscript is now in the proper format. If you require more information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you again for your kind consideration and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bert Cornelius Johan Groothoff Jac van der Klink Sandra Brouwer

# 1 Reviewer’s report

Version: 3 Date: 17 January 2013; Reviewer: Genevieve Gariepy

Discretionary Revisions

Comment 1

With regards to external validity, the authors wrote "Nonetheless, we agree
with this reviewer that external validity is not proven. Therefore, we have replaced the term external validity by representativeness (page 5) and moved information on this to Methods, subheading Setting and Procedures." This is good as it improves the strength of the study by showing readers that the sample is representative of the target population. However, the study objective still includes the assessment of external validity (p.4 and p.10). The methods section also includes information on the administrative data (which is already described in the newly written section of Setting and Procedure). The statistical analysis section still includes a paragraph on how external validity was assessed. Given the authors' statement above, these sections could be dropped from the manuscript. This would improve the readability of the text.

Response 1
We have revised the manuscript following the above recommendations and have now properly replaced or removed all terms and sections referring to external validity. Information on the assessment of representativeness is now exclusively placed in section Methods, subheading Setting and Procedures.