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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Me Editor, i thank you for accepting this paper to be published in such a top notch journal.

I have made the minor corrections as suggested by the reviews
Reviewer # 1 raised the issue of the lack of space between the sentences on page2. This has been taken into account. The space has been created between the sentences.

Reviewer # 2 raised a couple of minor comments
1. The study quality has been included by means of an asterix on page 13, table 1. The letters a, b, and c denote the quality of studies included
2. The issue of accuracy of the K-6 vs K-10 has also been mentioned in the conclusion section on page 11
3. We didn’t include the Monahan study in the review because it didn’t fit our criteria, and that’s the reason we didn’t discuss the accuracy of PHQ-2 vs PHQ-9
4. The cultural differences between validated scales have been mentioned on page 9, the discussion section.
5. The gold standard for the Tesfaye study has been changed from MINI to DSM-IV on table