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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the invitation to review this paper. On the whole it is well written and described in sufficient detail to enable replication. With all the measures collected, I am curious as to why the authors chose to use the Orebro rather than use a data driven approach. A comparison of the predictors using a data driven approach with the Orebro would be interesting.

This leads to the second query. In my opinion, a stronger rationale is needed for selecting the Orebro as a prognostic tool. Is there evidence to indicate that some of the domains included in the Orebro have previously been identified as prognostic of outcome? The title of the manuscript suggests that the short form Orebro was used. However, on reading, it appears that 2 questions were replaced with questions from other scales albeit measuring potentially the same construct. An explanation for replacing these 2 items should be provided with some indication of the internal reliability of the 'adapted' version. Were each of the additional items scored the same way as their comparator in the Orebro or as per the parent scale?

Discussion: A section on implications for end-users would be beneficial. What recommendations would the authors make for the way the tools should be used? When should it be administered (the Conclusion states 'early' but this is not defined in the manuscript) and by whom? Should the clinician use the original Orebro or the modified version? What should the clinician do with this information once low risk for recovery is identified? Or perhaps, the insurer case manager should administer this scale as they are responsible for approving additional services as required.

Limitations: one limitation not mentioned is the 30% loss to follow up.

All tables and figures are interesting and useful to support the results.

A few grammatical errors that need correcting:
Page 4, line 17-18
Page 4, line 25
Page 5, line 5
Page 5, line 18
Page 7, line 8
Page 8, line 23
Page 11, line 27,
Page 11, line 58
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