

## COVER LETTER AND RESPONSES TO WORLD JOURNAL OF PSYCHIATRY REVIEWERS

To the Editor,

Thank you for your time in considering our recently submitted manuscript "The R&R2 cognitive skills programme for mentally disordered offenders: Predictors of outcome".

All the authors have greatly appreciated the constructive feedback from your reviewers and we have been able to incorporate their comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. We have numbered their comments and our responses for convenience. Below, please find point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments, which include any revised or relevant text to the manuscript in quotes. The line and page numbers of the reviewer's comments correspond to the original submitted version of the manuscript and our responses correspond to the revised version of the manuscript that contains highlighted amendments.

Best Regards,

Susan Young

### Reviewer 1

1. Comment – All the abbreviations should be defined in the first time use (even in abstract).

Response – All abbreviations have been checked and amended as requested.

2. Comment – Is the study population sufficiently large depends on specific features of these interventions? This should be defined. (sic)

Response – We do not understand this question or what we are being asked to do.  
However we would comment that the sample size is sufficiently large for this type of study.

### Reviewer 2

1. Comment - The authors should make clear in the discussion that this is association and not causation.

Response – This amendment has been made on page 19 in the final paragraph as follows:  
"This is a cross-sectional study that investigates associations rather than causation, nevertheless, this study has added important new information to understanding factors predicting treatment completion/non-completion among MDOs."

2. Comment - A big problem with R&R is that the manuals are accessible only to people participating in the training. So people like me who are experts in behavior therapy (but not in this variety) have only a superficial notion what is really happening in R&R.

Response – We appreciate the issue regarding training raised by the reviewer. The R&R2 programmes are published by the Cognitive Centre of Canada and training is a requirement of this organization to ensure treatment integrity.

### Reviewer 3

1. Comment – The introduction is too long and needs to be reduced.

Response – We have carefully reviewed the introduction and have reduced the length as far as we can. We believe the material that remains provides an essential background to the study.

2. Comment – Some general statements regarding treatment need to be referenced.

Response – As requested, an appropriate reference has now been provided on page 5.

3. Comment – Within the same section clarification is needed regarding comments about mental health (e.g. what type of mental health is the program most responsive to?)

Response – We have specified that the programme is devised for those with serious mental health problems (e.g. psychosis) on page 5.

4. Comment – What is meant by “mentally unstable”?

Response – We have clarified this in the participants section as “Exclusion criteria included intellectual disability, patients who were mentally unstable on page 8 (e.g. experiencing serious current psychotic symptoms), and/or who posed a risk of violence to the researcher.

5. Comment – The descriptions of the main psychometric instruments need to be more succinct.

Response – We have revised these descriptions as requested.

6. Comment – Why did the authors not investigate Everitt and Pickles’ six factors?

Response – This study was a secondary analysis and the data was not available to investigate the six factors. We have raised it in the discussion on page 18 as a point for future research as follows “Future research should investigate the effects of these six factors.”

7. Comment – Exactly what attitudes towards violence need to be treated?

Response – We have specified this on page 18 as follows: “The two main violent attitudes measured by the MVQ, which have implications for treatment targets, are the use of violence to defend or enhance vulnerable self-esteem and the general acceptance that violence is justified as a way of life.”

8. Comment – The manuscript needs to be reviewed by a native English speaker.

Response – The lead author is a native English speaker from London, but we have gone through the manuscript again and made some minor amendments.

#### Editors Requests

1. Comment – Please provide translated file according to the guideline and format attached. (sic)

Response – This query relates to our comment that our “research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research” on page 1. This does not relate to formal funding for this research project but it is a requirement of Imperial College London that we acknowledge the money that Imperial gets from the BRC that is used to support the work of the Research office. We are happy for you to remove this section if you prefer.

2. Comment – Please provide the file signed/sealed by related institution, Thanks. (sic)

Response – We have scanned and uploaded the two relevant documents as requested.