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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for sending this new, well-revised version of the manuscript. The authors have improved most of the parts and addressed many of our previous comments. Below are some additional comments for them to consider.

Background

1. "...are considered gold standard strategies...." - maybe changed to "have been used in previous research as gold standards"..

2. "This introduces the concept of public health ....subsequently deteriorates" - some references are necessary.

3. "....have promise for use in compensation settings" - perhaps rephrased to indicate the authors' wish..

4. "...broader information about mood, anxiety..." - broader as compared to what? Please provide some comparative evidence to show the advantage of one against the other OR evidence on the limitations of others that are efficiently met by the one chosen.

5. "The DASS-21 has not been used.....engaged in compensation" - what other measures have been used in this setting and what is the current experience ?

6. "This cut-off score is therefore not appropriate..." - some justification is necessary for identifying this as "not appropriate".

7. In the introduction, I can see very clear evidence on the need to validate the tools in MVC victims but I miss some clear evidence on the need to test new tools in compensation settings. Besides mentioning that these specific tools have not been used in compensation...
settings, we don't know whether other tools have been used and why new tools are necessary in these settings.

Recruitment

8. "The 109 adults who consented … May 2017)". — This indicates only the source of the participants that enrolled in the study. However, there should be more detailed information on the sampling design, earlier in the methods. What was the geographical setting and the services involved in the recruitment process? How many and how were they selected?

9. Reference (34) needs to follow the reference style at the end.

Study design

10. I don't understand the time intervals between assessment 2 and assessment 3. They seem to be overlapping. Does assessment 3 refer to "6 months after the MVC"?

Discussion

11. How is the high prevalence of MDD and PTSD explained based on the local compensation practices? What are the implications for the post-trauma care in the local setting and what is currently offered to victims that needs to be improved?

12. In the limitations, there needs to be reference to the small sample size, the non-random selection of units, the geographical coverage and generalizability, the self-reported measures against clinical interview, etc. Additionally, some limitations are not explained. The readers may not understand what limitation lies behind the "study design".

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.

Yes

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:
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