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Reviewer’s report:

This is a review of the manuscript "A new conception and subsequent taxonomy of clinical psychological problems" submitted for publication in BMC Psychology.

I found this submission very interesting. It was beautifully written and rhetorically effective. It is dense, but it is dense with good information and a thoughtful analysis. There is much to like about this paper. I have a few minor suggestions for the author to consider:

1) Submission p. 6: The author's treatment of dimensional mental disorder constructs struck me as extreme and poorly justified; compared to other points made in the submission, this position seems weak. There has been a great deal of thinking and writing on dimensional mental disorder (and personality), which many consider different (but not worse) than categorical approaches. I would suggest a clearer formulation of what the authors wants to say on this point. It currently reads like a strawman argument.

2) There was what I view as a largely missed opportunity here to focus on developments in transdiagnostic research and classification. While transdiagnostic processes emerge, I would recommend the author look into work by the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology (HiTOP) consortium, which is creating an evidence-based classification system of mental disorder classification. While this may be "topographical" in the author's terms, it is nevertheless worth considering for inclusion, and more germane to the current presentation than RDoC. See Kotov et al. (2017) Journal of Abnormal Psychology. See other work as well by Thomas Achenbach, Robert Krueger (one paper is cited), Nicholas Eaton, Kristian Markon, Roman Kotov, David Watson, Lee Anna Clark, and many others.

3) I found the treatment of stigma reduction throughout to be well handled and appreciated.

4) The treatment of network models is both timely and behind-the-times. That is, I was very pleased to see it. However, many of the citations are from early network approaches, and the field has grown (and grows) very quickly. I would suggest the author read and cite more recent work, which has shed light on both the benefits and limitations of the network approach (e.g., within- and between-person networks, replicability issues).
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