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Reviewer's report:

In my opinion the paper has clearly been improved. I appreciate the clarification of how data has been collected, and the reasons for not involving the patients themselves. This is now satisfactorily described in the Limitation section.

However, some formulations in the abstract and the result section ought to be reformulated to avoid misunderstandings.

1. Abstract Methods, line 4-5: "While follow up was conducted primarily through telephone interviews" Here "of relatives" ought to be added.

2. Abstract Results, first line: "Of the 65 interviewed subjects" ought to be changed to: "Of the 65 subjects where follow-up data were available".

3. Main paper, Results, first line under 3.2 Mortality, suicide and depression: "Of the 65 patients who were successfully interviewed" ought to be changed to: "Of the 65 patients about whom we succeeded to collect follow-up data".

4. Main paper, Results, first line under 3.3 Diagnostic stability: "Of the 55 subjects who provided information" ought to be changed to: "Of the 55 subjectes about whom we had information".

In addition I have one minor comment:

5. Main paper, Line 9-10 under 4.6 Limitation: "Therefore, the high attrition rate has minimal effect on the outcome". May I suggest something like: "This reduces the likelihood that the high attrition rate has substantially biased outcome".

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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