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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a very fine comparison study among three screening currently used instruments for At-Risk schizophrenia. The study was well conducted and clearly reported. Essentially, all three proved comparable with good inter-rater reliability. My only suggestion is to replace the word "subjects" when referring to the interviewed relatives and to call them instead "study participants" or "participants."
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Respected authors, this is a well written paper and covers an interesting topic. To my knowledge, there hasn't been a paper which explores the three psychometric tools in regard to the specific UHR population. The only remark is a relatively old population for UHR and I think that should me mentioned as a limitation in the text, as it could affect the end result. I don't have any other remarks except that the English could be a bit polished.