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Dear Prof. Ryan

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revision of our manuscript entitled “Study approach and field work procedures of the MentDis_ICF65+ project on the prevalence of mental disorders in the elderly European population”. We have revised the manuscript according to your feedback, and herewith submit our revised manuscript to BMC Psychiatry on behalf of all authors.

We have carefully considered your comments and address these in the following.

Editor Comment:

Following initial quality controls checks, it has become apparent that some sections of the manuscripts will require revising before being sent out for peer review. The text in some parts is too similar/identical to previously published work (even if this is the authors own work). In particular this concerns the following lines: 178-219; 242-249; 295-298. I also think that it would be appropriate to reference ref17 in the introduction and to explain how this current manuscript builds on the previously publication.

Author reply:

We have revised the parts of the manuscript accordingly. The revised parts are

• Introduction, page 5, line 85 to 89
• Method, page 8, line 184 to page 9, line 217
• Method, page 10, line 239 to 247
• Method, page 12, line 291 to 295

In particular, at the end of the introduction, we now explicitly state how this manuscript builds on the MentDis_ICF65+ study protocol (ref 17). While the study protocol explained the plan for
conducting the MentDis study, this manuscript now reports on the finding of actually conducting the study. This contains detailed information on the adaptation, feasibility and psychometric properties of the instrument and detailed results on the sampling, final sample characteristics and representativeness as well as field procedures. These procedures and findings have not been previously reported.

The manuscript has been prepared to give a comprehensive report on the study approach and field procedures. However, the manuscript could be shortened further, for example by omitting information on instruments or the power calculation (and only reference ref17). In that case we would be grateful to receive your feedback.

Sincerely,

_____________

Jana Volkert, PhD, MSc, BA (Hons)
Research fellow
Department of Medical Psychology
University Medical Centre Hamburg