Author’s response to reviews

Title: The Transition from University to Work: what happens to Mental Health? A longitudinal study

Authors:

Amy Østertun Geirdal (amyoge@oslomet.no)

Per Nerdrum (perne@oslomet.no)

Tore Bonsaksen (tobo@oslomet.no)

Version: 2 Date: 16 Jan 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

This is a point-by-point response letter which accompany our revised manuscript. This letter provide a detailed response to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing exactly what amendments have been made to the manuscript text and where these can be viewed (e.g. Methods section, line 12, page 5). All changes to the manuscript are indicated in the text by using bold letters.

Action taken: all changes due to the reviewers comments are in bold letters.

Editor:

Your manuscript "The Transition from University to Work: what happens to Mental Health? A longitudinal study" (PSY0-D-18-00161R1) has been assessed by our reviewers, And was deemed not to contain sufficient detail in order to assess the soundness of the methodology.

Action taken: We do understand that “a decision has therefore not been possible”. But, it is difficult to understand what is meant with the sentence above, stating that the study “was deemed not to contain sufficient detail in order to assess the soundness of the methodology”. We have read the first reviews over again, only to find that we have met all the points raised by the reviewers and the editor, including those concerned with the methodology. Excepting the minor points raised by the reviewers in this particular review, especially those made by reviewer 3, we cannot find any remarks pertaining to the methodology.

A decision has therefore not been possible. The reviewers have raised a number of points which we believe would improve the manuscript and may allow a revised version to be published in BMC Psychology.

Reviewer reports:

Azizollah Arbabisarjou (Reviewer 1): Dear Author

It is better to correct the papers as two reviewers were writing to you" It is needed some corrections).

Action taken: We agree, and therefore met all the points raised at the first review round, including a review of the paper by an English-speaking writer.
Heather Stuart (Reviewer 3): Review - Transition from University

This paper is a re-review with comments by two reviewers. The first reviewer asked for limitations, but this is not possible until the article is accepted for publication (this is a results-free paper).

The second reviewer identified a multitude of grammatical and typographical mistakes. All of the mistakes that have been identified have been fixed and the paper has been reviewed by an English-speaking writer.

A few additional typos escaped scrutiny:

Pg. 8, line 135: The aims of the preset study (should be present)

Action taken: Page 8, line 97: Performed as suggested. “Preset” is changed to “present”
Pg 9, line 124-125: Suggest it be reworded as follows: "The GHQ-12 is a widely used self-report instrument for measuring psychological distress and for screening non-psychotic mental disorders".

Action taken: Page 9. Line 156; Done as suggested