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Reviewer’s report:

The authors present findings from an interesting study aimed to evaluate the prevalence of depression among poor and/or uninsured outpatients at the Baudelaire outpatient clinic at the Saint-Antoine Hospital in Paris. The aims of the study were also to characterize this depressed population and to analyze its demand for primary care in response to a depressive episode.

The purpose behind the study is relevant because immigrants and poor population in urban-western area are increasing and their mental health needs are quite often underestimated and not properly addressed by statutory services. However, this cross-sectional study needs several revisions listed below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Introduction

The studies about prevalence of depression in primary care setting are not scarce (please modify this statement in the abstract) .

See for example


However, the evidence available about prevalence of depression among immigrants and poor population attending general practice facilities are few (see Tarricone et al. meta-analysis 2012) and this point should be state more clearly in the introduction section.

A more detailed description of the setting where the study was carried out (Baudlaire hospitals) should be provided. The readers would know for example if the service belong to public health system or charity organization and if it
provides special attention to mental health problems.

Material and methods
The qualitative study is poorly described. It seems that it was conducted to devise the quantitative instrument used in the subsequent cross-sectional study. However, it is not described how the sample was collected and (more important) which qualitative open-questions were used and how the final qualitative questionnaire was devised.
The inclusion/exclusion criteria for quantitative- cross sectional study must be more clearly defined.
It must be described how migrant status and nationality were defined (self-ascription?)
The final quantitative research instrument must be more deeply described.
M.I.N.I. is a diagnostic structured interview for ICD-10 and DSM-IV disorders. Which diagnostic categories the authors included in their study?.

Ethical: I agree that no formal ethical approval should be obtained. However, it must specify that all subjects give a proper informed consent to take part at the study!

Results
"MINI indicated an estimated prevalence of depressive episode of 57.6%..." Do the authors mean that they found a prevalence of current major depressive episode of 57.6?
Please, give data on refusals and differences with people who consented to take part at the study.
How low-socioeconomic status was defined?
Immigrants: do the authors mean first generation immigrants? How many were second generation migrants?
Please remove any not significant results, such as “although the association was not significant …women receiving AME had a five time greater risk of depression…”

Discussion
It is not clear if the clinic where the study was conducted gives special attention to psychiatric problems. In this case, the high prevalence found of depression is not surprising. In any case, the authors should compare since the first paragraph of the discussion section their prevalence results with those of studies conducted in health services and not in general population.
Main results should be summarized in the first paragraphs of the discussion section.
In my opinion, the wiliness of the interviewed people to speak with their physician about their mental health problems is a relevant result and should be commented among main results in the first paragraph of the discussion.
Conclusion should be more focused on clinical implication for international readers.

Minor essential revisions

Table 3: give explanation for “model 1, 2 and 3 and list the variables included in those models in the foot-notes of the table.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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