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Reviewer's report:

The paper is short and globally easy to read. It deals with an important practical problem (screening of depression in patients with diabetes). The sample size is acceptable. The methodology is simple but globally correct. The conclusions are wise and appropriate on my point of view.

Major compulsory revisions

1/ The psychiatric diagnosis (gold standard) is not detailed enough: was it the same clinician for all the 185 patients? What was his/her level of experience? Does he/she used a structured interview? What was the average duration of interview? The interview had only implications for research or also for treatment? How many patients received a treatment after the interview? Etc.

2/ The prevalence of depression found in the paper is surprisingly high and not consistent with the literature. This is discussed briefly in the discussion, but I am not convinced by the argument proposed by the authors. This point should be considered carefully since it cast some doubts on the reliability of the clinical diagnosis.

3/ some minor but important points:

a/ the discussion on LR and pre-post test probability is not clear enough.

b/ it is mentionned that "CES-D is more accurate in detecting MDD than the PHQ-9" but there no statistical comparison of the AUC.

c/ it is mentioned that "The finding of this study has demonstrated that these questionnaires are valid and reliable in Persian language": this is not true. The only argument in favor of that is an acceptable Cronbach estimated on 40 subjects. This is definitely not enough.
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