Reviewer's report

Title: Psychotic and schizotypal symptoms in non-psychotic patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder

Version: 2
Date: 11 March 2015

Reviewer: Kelly Buck

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The research question is well-defined in the ms.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Method are appropriate.
3. Are the data sound? Data appear to be sound.
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Figures appear to be appropriate.
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Well-written discussion with connection to the current literature.
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes.
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.
10. Is the writing acceptable? I would suggest that the authors use “non-psychotic” when they describe the OCD group and the control group and use it consistently throughout the ms for clarity. For example, “OCD non-psychotic patients” and “general non-psychotic psychiatric outpatient sample.” Please explain ERP when it is first introduced on pg. 5. After that it is fine to refer to ERP. Explain what the “eclectic psychotherapies” were. It still needs a more thorough review to correct minor grammatical errors. The above would be considered minor essential revisions.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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