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Author’s response to reviews:

August 8th, 2019

Editor

BMC Psychology

Respected Editor,

Re: PSYO-D-18-00171R2

Validation of the Recent Life Changes Questionnaire (RLCQ) for stress measurement among adults residing in urban communities in Pakistan. Azmina Artani, MSc Epidemiology and Biostatistics; Ayeesha Kamran Kamal; Syed Iqbal Azam; Moiz Artani; Shireen Shehzad Bhamani, BScN, Msc Epidemiology and Biostatistics; Mehreen Saif; Fariha Afzal Khan; Nazir Alam BMC Psychology

Thank you for your review. We have made all the requested revisions to our manuscript. Please find our responses as below:
Comments:

Comment 1:
"The rate of agreement between the two psychologists was 94.32% (Kappa= 0.84)". Plural
Response: Thank you for the observation. We have made the change (highlighted on page 5, line 86).

Comment 2:
Please, replace “Anti-Social Personality Disorder” with “Antisocial Personality Disorder” throughout the manuscript.
Response: Thank you for the observation. We have corrected this throughout the manuscript (highlighted on page 4 line 73, page 9 line 165, in table 2 and on page 13 line 237)

Comment 3:
Please, rephrase the following statement for better clarity. “Area under the curve (AUC) of receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) was determined for each of the mental illnesses which MINI caters with the composite score obtained on the adapted RLCQ”
Response: Thank you. The above statement has been paraphrased and highlighted on page 11, line 213-215.

Comment 4:
Statistical analysis plan paragraph. Please, report the criteria for the interpretation of the Kappa coefficients
Response: Thank you for this observation. We have included the criteria for interpretation of Kappa coefficients on page 11, line 219-220.

Comment 5:
“Of the total, 222 87% of the sample population was married and 76% of the population was of females. 50% of the sample population had at least received secondary level of education”.
Please, use the term “sample” instead of “sample population” to identify the participants throughout the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for the observation. The suggested change was made throughout the manuscript (highlighted on page 9 line 179, page 11 line 223-224 and page 13 line 239).

Comment 6:
Table 2. Please, use lowercase “n” instead of “N”
Response: The change has been made and highlighted in Table 2.

Comment 7:
Discussion paragraph. Row 283. Please, replace “exercise” with “study”
Response: The suggested change has been made and highlighted on page 16, line 281.

Comment 8:
The present study only supports the ability of the instrument to identify individuals reporting stress related to having a mental disorder but it does not allow you to predict the development of a mental disorder over time or identify high-risk individuals (despite the ROC analysis), because you have not used a longitudinal study and the measure only covers stress related to having a mental condition. Therefore, I recommend you to discuss with more caution the capacity of the tool from this point of view. Please, rephrase accordingly the statement reported at row 283-286 in the Discussion section.
Response: Thank you for the observations. We have rephrased the statement and have highlighted it on page 16, line 281-287.

Similarly, as you did not test the predictive validity of the instrument through a longitudinal design, the following statement at row 301-302 should be changed, specifically with regard to the identification of high-risk individuals “Our aim of adapting and validating RLCQ was to develop a screening tool for mental health which enable the capacity to measure stressors of the population accurately and identify high risk individuals”
Response: Thank you for the observations. We have rephrased the statement (highlighted on page 17, line 298-300).

Comment 9:
Discussion paragraph, row 333-339. This statement is too long and difficult to read. Please, shorten and rephrase it
Response: Thank you. We have made the suggested changes on page 18, line 332-338.

Comment 10:
Discussion paragraph, row 333-334. “Additionally, our rationale was to take development of mental disorder as a criterion”. Please, replace “development of mental disorder” with “presence of a mental disorder”.
Response: Thank you. We have replaced the word as suggested (highlighted on page 18, line 332)

Comment 11:
Limitations paragraph. I suggest to cite other measures of stress which should be used in future research to cover stress experience instead of the stress-related to having a mental disorder
Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have added a statement at the end of the limitation section.

We thank you for the detailed attention to our work! We have made all the changes required and it has greatly improved our manuscript.

Best Regards,

Ayeesha Kamran Kamal
Professor Neurology
Section of Neurology, Dept. of Medicine
Director Stroke Fellowship Program

Aga Khan University Stadium Road – 74800 Karachi, Pakistan

Email: ayeesha.kamal@aku.edu

Phone: 9221 – 34930051-4559.