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Reviewer's report:

General

The paper is well written and includes interesting findings, especially those from the "content analysis." The clarity of the paper will be improved once Tables 2, 3 and 4 have been reformatted.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. It is stated that open-ended questions were analyzed using "content analysis." A brief description of this method should be included, as well as one or more references.
2. Tables 2, 3 and 4 are presented in a confusing manner. In Table 2, there should be three main columns with headings such as: Total, Location, Sex. Under Location, there should be subheading: Rural, Urban. Under Sex, the subheadings are: Male, Female. In Table 3, there should be three main rows with headings such as: Total, Location, Type of practice. The subheadings should be indented. Similar remarks apply to Table 4.
3. The p-values from the chi-squared analysis should be added as footnotes to the revised Tables 2, 3 and 4, with a phrase explaining what is being compared with what.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. On page 5 there is the statement “There were no differences between the characteristics of the FDs practicing and the respondents in the study (table 2).” This is too strong an assertion, as Table 2 considers only urban-rural location and sex.
2. Average age, which is mentioned in the Discussion, should be added to Table 2.
3. The numbers of subjects, 115 and 90, discussed on page 7 do not correspond precisely with Table 4.
4. In Table 3, I think the headings should be “Is it your daily work?” “Are you ready to deal with it?” and “Do you deal with depression?”
5. In the Discussion, it is remarked that “51% of the practicing FDs agreed to take part.” But, 500 were invited and 205 agreed, which is 41%.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. As the survey questionnaire consisted of only 10 questions, perhaps the authors could include it as an Appendix.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.
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