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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We made the final adjustments to the manuscript as described below. We like to thank you and the reviewers for the support to improve this paper.

Kind regards,
Bea Tiemens

Technical Comments:
-- Please move your Declarations to after the conclusions.

Moved

-- In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
New text: The research reported, including design of the study, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and writing the manuscript, has been funded by Pro Persona Research of the Stichting Pro Persona Mental Health Care.

-- Please include a statement in the Authors’ contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

The last sentence was changed: All authors read, revised and approved the first manuscript and the revisions and gave final approval of the version to be published.

--Thank you for providing the link to the methods section. However, at the moment the link appears not to be working (www.ggzrichtlijnen.nl). Please can you provide an updated link so we are able to assess its availability before progressing with your manuscript.

https://www.ggzrichtlijnen.nl/ should be working.

-- Please confirm whether your study was submitted to and approved by your institutional ethics committee and include a statement to this effect in your Methods section. Please also ensure that the full name of your ethics committee is included in this statement. If the need for ethics approval was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

In the methods section the information was extended: Ethical approval for conducting the study was not required because the measures and assessment procedure were part of usual care and anonymized data were used. Information which does not relate to an identified or identifiable natural person does not fall under the European General Data Protection Regulation.