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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Associate Editor Ardavan Khoshnood, BMC Emergency Medicine

Please consider our revised manuscript, "Evaluation of Tools to Assess Psychological Distress: How to Measure Psychological Stress Reactions in Citizen Responders– A Systematic Review”, for publication in BMC Emergency Medicine. We appreciate the interest that the editors and reviewers have taken in our manuscript and the constructive review they have given. We addressed the concerns of the reviewers.

Thank you again for consideration of our revised manuscript.

Reviewer 1

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I have only minor comments for the authors. The study provides a summary of possible psychometric tools which may be used to assess the psychological impact of providing bystander CPR to patients with OHCA among citizen responders. The manuscript has some minor grammatical / English language errors throughout which could also be amended.
Comment:
- Does Table 1 include the exact search terms used in your review, or did you truncate some of the terms (e.g. did you search for 'bystander' or only 'bystander rescuer')? If terms were not truncated/ abbreviated, did you consider using terms such as 'responder'? If these are not the exact terms used, then please include.

Reply:
Thank you for the comment. We have included the applied truncation in our table. The exact terms used are now included.

Comment:
- Pg 11 / 12: A brief description of the scoring system used for the IES/IES-R would be beneficial in the paragraphs that provide an overview of these tools. This would assist with interpreting the results presented in para 2 of pg 12.

Reply:
We appreciate this suggestion and have applied a short description of the scoring system used for the scale in the results section as requested, page 12.

Changes in the manuscript:
The maximum overall score possible in the IES-R is 12. The sum of the means of each subscale is recommended instead of raw sums.

Comment:
- Pg12, line 16: Should this say sensitivity instead of sensibility?

Reply:
Thank you for the comment, we have corrected as suggested.
Reviewer 2

Dear authors. The subject is very interesting to raise: the psychological distress in Citizen Responders in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. The methodology is of high quality and very well described.

Discretionary revisions:

- add IES-R in this manuscript

-specify IES internal validity, inter-rater reliability, discriminant ability, and face validity. If IES was compared to PTSD scale.

Reply:

Thank you for the very relevant comments which we agree on.

The IES-R has now been added to the manuscript as an attached file. The psychometrics of the IES-R has now been described in the results section on page 12.

Changes in the manuscript:

It has been shown that high IES scores 1 week after a traumatic event predicts PTSD 6 months later with 92% sensitivity [25][26]. The maximum overall score possible in the IES-R is 12. The sum of the means of each subscale is recommended instead of raw sums. High levels of internal consistency and discriminative validity have been previously reported for the IES-R. A Japanese translation of the scale reported test-retest values and Rash et al described a high level of internal consistency among total and subscale scores (Crohnbach’s alpha 0.95). The convergent validity has been reported with consistent and high correlations between the IES-R and related measures of PTSD[27] [21] [28] [29].
Comment:
- review bibliography: ref 2
ref 6 lack publication year
ref 7, 15, 25 only initials of the first name
ref 24 uppercase
ref 26 lack publication year
ref 30 reverse first name and last name
ref 39 delete "volume"

Reply:
Thank you for the comments on the references which have all been revised.