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Reviewer's report:

The paper is well written. I think the topic is very important for this reviews and appears to incorporate an appropriate methodology, but same important revisions have to be done. This revisions could change the reported results.

***************Major Compulsory Revisions

1- Background: it is no clear first part of the backgound section. I think is important that you report the percentage of the prevalence of your outcome respect to the west studies, in order to evaluate the socio-cultural differences.

2-Methodology:
2.1 You named a follow-up study, but no data you reported in the results. Could you explain better the study design?
2.2 You haven't considered the clinic in the analysis and it is impossible to evaluate the potential confounding effect.

3 - Results
3.1 Can you explain the % of response respect to the type of contact? To avoid bias, I think is import consider the type of contact like a possible confounding variable in your study
3.2 "Those who refused to partecipate in this study did not differ significantly....". Can you provide a p-value?
3.3 "The population served by two health centres was similar in terms of gender and age". Could you upgrade the results with data (% respect to total) and a p-value in order to confirm this results?
3.4 Table 3: Generalized anxiety disorder have a numerosity of only 5 patients and aOR is significant. How you have estimated the model without encounter prediction problems? Same considerantion is for "Alcohol dependency disorder and post tramuatic stress disorder".

4-Discussion and Conclusion
Nothing to report

******************Minor Essential Revisions

0- Abstract ok
1- Background:
1.1 Please change Schlebusch and Vanda (2010) with Schlebusch and Vanda [14]

2 - Methodology:
2.1 Why do you haven't evaluated comorbidities and smoke habits? have you collected this data?
2.2 Alpha of cronbach is a results obtained using your data. Could you move it in results.
2.3 A level of significance of 0.1 is too high. You have a good number of patients and I think the classic alfa equal to 0.05 is more appropriate.
2.4 In statistical section is not reported any type of statistical test. According with the first part of the results section, I think you should use parametric and no parametric test to verify the homogeneity of the confounding variables between the strata.

3- Results
3.1 Table 1: OR only for sex and age, aOR for rest of the variables. At the bottom you should indicate the variables used for the adjusting (*)
3.2 Table 2: aOR only. At the bottom you should indicate the variables used for the adjusting (*)
3.3 Table 3: aOR only. At the bottom you should indicate the variables used for the adjusting (*)
3.4 Table 4: there is no presence of table headers.
3.5 Table 1-4: in bold only significant p-values

4-Discussion and Conclusions
In the last part of the discussion section could be interesting to include some articles of suicide prevention measures.

Discretionary Revisions
Nothing to report
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