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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Rami Bou Khalil, Dr. Madhur Basnet & Prof. Dr. Peter Henningsen,

Thank you for your positive feedback on our manuscript. We have revised it according to the suggestions provided by the reviewers and included below our point-by point responses to the comments made.

In our last revision, we uploaded Figure 1 as an alternative to Table 1, which we have removed in this version. So, this time we have not uploaded Figure 1 and also the supplementary questionnaire since we assume it is redundant.

Please also note that the author name Clara-Louisa Müller has been changed to Clara-Louisa Sandmann because of personal reasons. If it does not cause any inconvenience we would prefer to use her updated last name ‘Sandmann’. We believe this does not require the ‘Request for change in authorship’ form, but if it does please inform us.

We would feel honored if the paper is accepted for publication in BMC Psychiatry.

Regards,
Reviewer reports:

Madhur Basnet, MD (Reviewer 1):
Thank you for such wonderful revision.
I've few more suggestions that could be made to improve your article:

1. Only few pertinent findings could be mentioned in the results than repeating everything present in the table.
   - We have revised the corresponding sections accordingly. We have shortened the text related to Table 1 and Table 2 and kept the information in the tables.
   (p. 6, lines 138-142; p.7, lines 145-150; p.16-17, lines 380-386)

2. It's better to mention the numbers(n) with the percentage(%) rather than percentage alone. You might have done that as your sample size is less but still it's better to mention the numbers.
   - We have changed it.
   (p.7, 146-150; p. 15, lines 381-382)

3. My statistics is not that strong. Even then, I see no point of mentioning the "overall p-value" in table 2.
   We have removed this overall p-value from three places as requested.
   (p. 16, line 385-386, table 2; p.2, line 39; p.7, line 146)

Thank you very much for your helpful suggestions.

Peter Henningsen (Reviewer 2):
The authors have successfully revised the manuscript.
One minor point remains: the psychogenetic tradition of seeing psychosomatic medicine as the application of psychoanalysis in medicine is by no means a specifically German tradition, e.g. it was very prevalent in the US until the 1960s...

- We did not want to imply this and agree with Prof Henningsen’s comment. We have rephrased this information and provided another reference to the context (The American Psychosomatic Society – integrating mind, brain, body and social context in medicine since 1942 by Herrmann-Lingen, C.).
(p. 3, lines 61-63)

Thank you once again for your valuable reviews.