Dear Editor,

Dear Reviewers

Thank you for the feedbacks regarding the manuscript BMWH-D-15-00010R1, Cognitive appraisal of exposure to specific types of trauma. A pilot study of gender differences.

We have reviewed the aforementioned manuscript, taking into account the input from reviewers.

The literature review was broadened to include the impact of disability on cognitions. No study was found to explicitly address the impact of disability upon cognitions relating to gender role, and how these may differ between males and females.
Using PTCI as one of the main assessment tools of the study represents an original research contribution. The data generated by this comparative approach of men and women’s negative posttraumatic cognitions is valuable for further research on gendered cognitions related to trauma exposure, its consequences and management. The data of the study are now presented and discussed in the manuscript to reflect this.

The issue that validating data for the PTCI in a Romanian context is not available yet has been included in the discussions as a limitation of the study. Moreover, the scope of using PTCI as assessment tool has been reframed, taking into account the fact that study data cannot be interpreted in the context of "the spectrum of masculinity / femininity" and "culturally – specific gender differences" if no PTCI validation data is available for the study population. The Methodology, Discussions and Conclusions sections have been revised accordingly, to reflect this.

The manuscript now explicitly states that none of the study participants have received psychological intervention since traumatic exposure. Also, the title of the software package SPSS is now correctly outlined.

The study is now framed as a 'Pilot Study' of gender differences in cognitions experienced by participants recruited in metropolitan Romania from health settings where they were receiving treatment for temporary or permanent physical consequences of accidental exposure to 3 types of traumatic events which were non-sexual in nature and did not involve interpersonal violence. The results are presented in a revised manner in order to more clearly reflect the data. The subgroup without posttraumatic disability is now more clearly framed.

The sentence using the words "depend on", from the Abstract and the beginning of the Discussions section, was rewritten in order to exclude inferences of causality between intensity of PTSD symptoms and presence of posttraumatic disability, on one hand, and negative cognitions on the other hand.

The study limitations have been rewritten to reflect all reviewer suggestions more comprehensively, and proposals as to how these limitations could be addressed in future research are now explicitly stated. The limitations stemming form the cross – sectional design of the study were explicitly addressed.
The statements regarding masculine and feminine stereotypes from the Discussions and Conclusions section were rewritten in order to explicitly address the fact that no assertion regarding those stereotypes in the cultural context of the study can readily be made without clear normative data regarding gender stereotypes and more specific gender role assessments.

The paper now also addresses both positive and negative adaptations to trauma as shaped by gender identification, with an explicit mention of adaptive and maladaptive outcomes for various strategies employed by men and women for managing trauma and its consequences.

The discussion now addresses more explicitly the issue of the gendered nature of trauma, stating how the experience of sexual, interpersonal and other types of trauma differently shapes processes of adaptation and survival in men and women.

The issue of participants with permanent physical deficits after trauma was also addressed in the revised discussions and conclusions. The study results are discussed in order to explicitly state that they could reflect the impact of disability as much as the trauma exposure per se. The interpretative comments made in the Discussion were revised to explicitly address this issue. Moreover, the discussion now outlines research strategies that could further address this issue in order to differentiate the specific contributions of trauma exposure and physical consequences of trauma.

The serious physical consequences of the exposure, the endurance of a protracted period of disability (and its associated comprehensive social, occupational, financial impact) are now explicitly included in discussions as factors which contribute to explain the findings of the study. The methodological limitations of the study are now clearly stated, with proposals on how further studies can utilize the results which the paper offers.

In the revision process which we have detailed thus far, we also revised the scope of the added author's involvement to this manuscript. The added author provided statistical and methodological input and critical feedback for the scientific review of the manuscript, hence the decision to be added as co – author of the revised manuscript. Please advise regarding specific procedures for changes in authorship status performed in this stage of the manuscript processing.
We appreciate the kind input of reviewers and trust that the revised manuscript thoroughly addresses the comments.

Kind regards,

Corresponding author