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Dear Editor,

Re: Taking care of our future doctors: A service evaluation of a Medical Student Mental Health Service (CSMHS)

Many thanks for your letter with the very helpful comments and suggestions for improvement of the readability of this paper. A point by point response to each of these concerns are highlighted below:

Reviewer 2:
Reviewer comments for revised manuscript, "Taking care of our future doctors: A service evaluation of a medical student mental health service"
The authors have made changes and the paper is improved. Most of the remaining issues are due to inadequate proof-reading. The authors should absolutely ensure that the next revision does not contain grammatical errors.

Abstract Results first paragraph: In the first sentence, take out "with" and make two sentences. This happens elsewhere in the manuscript and should be edited similarly. Abstract Results second paragraph: take out "with" and make two sentences. In the last sentence, consider changing to "Feedback from participants indicated that students were…."

Abstract Conclusions: This section must provide more than simply restating the results. What is the importance of your findings for the field of student mental health? What do you want readers to conclude after reading about your service?

We have addressed the grammatical issues and highlighted the main findings in the conclusion section.

Background p.5, line 1: this is a run-on sentence within parentheses. Consider ending the sentence with "clinical students" and start a new sentence with "These are medical students who have."
Background p.5, line 13: this is not punctuated correctly. Please take out "with" - see similar comment above.
Background p. 5, line 20: "where" is not the best word choice. Consider changing to "…and when necessary, a clinical psychologist." To clarify: In your service do psychiatrists always provide the first line and then refer to psychologists only when necessary? Please also state what would make referral to a psychologist necessary.

We have made the grammatical changes suggested and clarified that psychiatrists always provide an initial assessment and explained that psychological therapy is based on student choice and existing guidelines for evidence based psychological treatments.

Methods p.5, line 51: take out "during induction" (redundant) Methods p.6, line 1: consider changing to "…plan is made jointly by the…”
Methods p.8, line 52: delete "They compared their findings and discussed them to agree on the final themes." This is self-evident. The sentence contains grammatical errors and is not needed. You might consider adding "discussed" to the previous sentence, i.e., "…analysed and discussed the written feedback…” "Qualitative" can also be deleted as written feedback is qualitative data.

The changes to the wording have been made as suggested.

Results p. 9, lines 11-18: "…of the clinical students of the year" is not clear. Similarly, the entire sentence which goes from line 11 to line 18 is not clear. Please break into smaller, clearer sentences.
Results p. 9, lines 40-42: The use of "with" is again problematic. To make this grammatically correct, consider changing to "…mental health issues. Independent psychiatrists provided reports for the panel if required."
Results p. 10, line 3: This sentence belongs in the discussion, not the results.
Results p. 10, line 24: instead of "vast majority" please state the actual finding.
Results p. 10, lines 25-30: The information contained in these sentences needs to be described more clearly. Rather than "...a further 23 students..." simply state the School's intermission rate for all students so it can be compared to the intermission rate among students in your sample. If it is not possible to obtain the School's overall intermission rate, this should be stated.

Results p. 10, lines 44-46: To make this less cumbersome, consider changing to "Students appeared to become less depressed, less anxious and reported functioning better" (with statistical results included).

We have made the changes to the wording as suggested.

With regards the Intermission rate, we do have some data about the overall number of students intermitting from the School and have included the information for clarity.

Discussion p. 11, lines 31-33: To make it clear which school does what, consider changing to (for example) "...in that all students at Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine are first evaluated by a psychiatrist, while students at (other school) begin therapy with a psychologist and are only referred to a psychiatrist when (state under which conditions the other school makes a referral to a psychiatrist)." Again, the use of the word "with" is problematic.

Discussion p.11, line 53: a comma is not necessary after "mental health issues"

We have clarified the differences in the CSMHS and other similar services who have published their service evaluation.

Discussion p.11, line 55: consider taking out "earlier in their medical training" as this is redundant. "prior to attending the CSMHS" is adequate.

We take your point that this sentence may sound repetitive and have made modifications as suggested.

Conclusions: This section needs to be re-written to make it grammatically correct. The meanings and potential uses of each of the specific findings and the entire study must be succinctly summarized here. The authors' conclusions need to be clearly stated. As it stands now, the content doesn't match the study's importance.

Conclusions p. 13 line 56: add an apostrophe and hyphen "...students' longer-term well-being."

Many thanks for your suggestion to re-word the conclusion section. We have made significant changes to this part of the paper which we hope will be acceptable to the Reviewer and Editor.

Please look over the manuscript carefully for other errors and typos before returning your revision.

We have proofread the manuscript as suggested and would be very grateful for consideration of this paper for publication.

Yours sincerely

Dr Rebecca Jacob DPM MPhil FRCpsych