

Detailed Responses to the Reviewer's Comments

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thanks for providing us with this great opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript (Manuscript NO: 71000) to the World Journal of Clinical Cases. Many thanks for your detailed and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have tried our best to revise the manuscript by incorporating all the suggestions by the review panel. The detailed responses to the reviewers' comments are presented below.

We hope this revised manuscript has addressed your concerns, and look forward to hearing from you.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

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 be 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.

Response: Thank you for the detailed review. The participants included in our research were all the lineal relative by blood and collateral relatives by blood up to the third degree of kinship of patients with schizophrenia including their parents, children, so the group of participants was relatively old..

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

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."

Response: Thank you for the detailed review. The word "subjects" has been replaced by "participants." in the manuscript.

Science editor:

The authors compared three standard psychometric interviews to diagnose ultra-high psychiatric risk subjects. I find it a well-structured interesting study. On the whole, the manuscript has no big problems. It's a great work. The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the author are not clear and should be more specific. ROC diagnostic charts can be used in this studies?

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: Thank you for the detailed review. The inclusion and exclusion criteria were supplied in the manuscript. We didn't use the ROC diagnostic charts in this study because the time for follow-up was relative short and there was no proper golden standard. We plan to bring in the ROC diagnostic analysis base on the long time follow-up in the future studies.