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Reviewer’s report:

Katerud and Kvarstein criticize in their correspondence that Löf et al (BMC Psychiatry, 18: 185) made some misleading and wrong remarks on the article by Kvarstein et al (Psychol Psychother; 88: 71-86). Katerud and Kvarstein aim to rectify the following points

1. Löf et al wrote the study was not based on a community-based sample. Katerud and Kvarstein point out that their study was community-based.

   a. Assessment: Löf et al wrote that the study by Kvarstein et al was not community-based. Katerud and Kvarstein show in their correspondence that the study was community-based. However, based on the article by Kvarstein et al this was not clearly stated as the presentation was imprecise. Therefore, this omission by Löf et al does not appear to have been intended.

2. Löf et al wrote that it was not clear how the BPD diagnoses were established and whether diagnoses were valid and reliable. Katerud and Kvarstein point out that they used the SCID-II and reported on the reliability of the diagnoses.

   a. Assessment: Kvarstein et al clearly described the process of diagnosis and the way the diagnoses were checked for reliability. This is a clear misrepresentation of the study by Kvarstein et al

3. Löf et al reported an effect size of 1.05 for the study by Kvarstein et al. Katerud and Kvarstein write that the effect size was 1.79.

   a. Assessment: The effect size for symptom distress was 1.79 in the Kvarstein et al article. There was no 1.05 effect size reported. I cannot retrace why Löf et al reported an effect size of 1.05.

In summary, I conclude that the correction sent by Katerud and Kvarstein is justified. In one case (2), Löf et al did clearly not report the right information, in one case (3), it is not comprehensible why they reported the wrong effect size, in one case (1), it was a mere misunderstanding caused by an imprecision made by Kvarstein et al.

The correspondence is fair and aims mainly on the correction of the wrong information. I have no major recommendations for adaptations. However, maybe it could be worthwhile to address the fact that an imprecision in the original article led -partially- to the misunderstanding in 1).
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