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Reviewer's report:

Armstrong et al. present a well-written manuscript estimating the prevalence of depression, anxiety, and SI among users of IV drugs in Delhi. The sampling methods are rigorous. A few comments on the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Abstract, results. Please change “prevalence of depression” to “prevalence of depressive symptoms” here and throughout the manuscript (this language is already used in most portions of the manuscript).

2) The absence of a comparison group should be noted in the limitations.

3) Research question 3 would seem appropriate to be included in this manuscript.

4) Methods, participants. Please specify whether informed consent was verbal or written.

5) Please provide generic names for all medications reported in manuscript and tables.

6) Several paragraphs in the discussion appear to editorialize more than discuss data that comes directly from this study. In particular: end of paragraph 5, paragraph 6, paragraph 15, and final sentence of discussion.

Discretionary Revisions

1) Methods, participants. It is not clear what “coordinated by Sharan” means. Please explain.

2) Please provide the reported sensitivities and specificities for the measure used (PHQ-9 and GAD-7) in the manuscript from other samples.

3) Please consider providing more background on statistical models and data analytic methods.

4) Results, Demographics. Consider reporting 11% as 1 in 9 instead of 1 in 10. Please consider dropping word “consequently” which implies cause and effect later in same paragraph.

5) Results, final sentence. Are these mutually exclusive categories (plan to kill themselves and attempted to kill themselves)?
6) The prevalence of common mental health symptoms would seem to represent the main finding of the paper though seems de-emphasized in the discussion.

7) Table 1, please clarify “smack/brown sugar” in table legend.

8) Table 3, could consider reporting median and interquartile range as well, particularly given that in many samples these measures are not normally distributed.
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