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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for your work in facilitating for people with stress-related illness. Despite this, I suggest rejecting this study. There are two major problems that form the basis of my point of view. The main problem is that you do not describe the RLCQ, in terms of content, number of items, how to estimate the individual's ratings, etc. Furthermore, another major problem is that you use MINI as a gold standard, and MINI does not intend to measure stress-related illness. Although MINI measures stress, it is post-traumatic stress, which is not the same as stress-related illness (ICD-10; F43.8 and F43.9).

Abstract. I miss the aim of the study, as well as what kind of data analysis you used. Keywords; please use other keywords; the ones you have chosen are already included in the title.

Background. I miss a definition of stress and stress related disorders. Please, also define Common Mental Disorders (CMD), which is an accepted concept (anxiety, depression and stress related disorders), but you also add other diagnoses in this concept, such as bipolar disease, suicidal etc. Further, the aim needs to be clearer, will the aim be to create a new instrument, or is it to test an existing instrument for its criterion validity?

Methods. Describe the RLCQ in detail regarding content, number of items, how it is rated, if the scale is on ordinal level or not, time for administration etc.

Discussion. There is need to develop your instrument systematically. Use the literature, for example Kazdin's Research Design in Clinical Psychology, which describes how to systematically develop and test an instrument.

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.

Yes
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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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