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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

With much interest I have read this paper that describes an evaluation of all presentations to “PAS”. I think this paper provides us with relevant and important information, especially for comparison with other specialized clinics in this field. Content wise, I do not have much comments. However, I do feel that the manuscript can be optimized in a few ways. Below, I’ve put some suggestions for the authors to polish their manuscript to optimize it for reading.

1. The paper is mainly descriptive in nature. Although the authors acknowledge this at the end of the Discussion, it would be helpful and informative if they would state this in their Abstract and at the beginning of the Introduction section. In this way, the reader knows immediately what to expect. I found myself expecting something different after reading the Abstract. This is no problem, because the findings reported are interesting anyway, but it would be better to match expectations and actual content, I feel.

2. The introduction, although interesting, is quite long and wordy. I wonder if it is really necessary to discuss in such depth definitions, outcomes and risk factors for UHR status, DUP and comorbidity, if the main goal of the paper is to describe service users of which the UHR-individuals are only a sub-population. Although the information discussed is relevant and interesting, perhaps it can be shortened and adjusted to relevance: what part of this elaborate discussion is really relevant for the introduction of the PAS, its services and its clients? From this perspective, the most relevant paragraph is likely the one on “Limited reporting about implementation of specialized psychosis related services”.

3. Similarly, the Methods section (in particular the Data sources section) is quite elaborate and wordy, and sometimes difficult to follow. For example: I found the sentence on page 10 “Importantly, baseline classification of clients into groups was based on all available data for the first three of these timeframes” difficult to understand, even with the following explanatory sentence. Could the authors rephrase this please?

4. The strongest parts of the paper are the Results and the Discussion section. Here, some really interesting and relevant information is presented is a clear way.

5. Although I understand that the focus of PAS (and thus of the current paper) is
on psychosis, would it be possible for the authors to discuss (briefly) in the Discussion also the position of PAS and other psychosis-related services to other youth mental health services that focus on other psychopathological presentations? I would be very interested in reading about this, because it would help to get a better overview of the organization of youth mental health care in Australia. This would also be productive for comparison of (youth) mental health services and their clients across different countries.
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