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Reviewer's report:

It is a psychometric properties assessment of a Portuguese Translated version of IPOS. It is not clearly stated in the Title. The causes the title to be misleading. There is no clear description of IPOS in the whole article. The reader has no clue at all what is IPOS and what is the scale measuring about. The methods session is poorly written. There is no description of the scale. Results were included into the Methods session. The sampling method is unclear. How could it be the mean reason for exclusion is “Healthy”. What is the sample size calculation? There are centres with 1 or 3 subjects included into the study. How could it be? Was the sampling frame selected appropriately?

The analysis and finding description are poorly written. How was the ROC determined? What was the criteria used for cut off? Why was IPOS used to determined the sensitivity and specificity for depression and anxiety? What was IPOS has to do with anxiety and depression?

The study objectives, design, methods are unclear. The results and findings are questionable.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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