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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions
Non-professional help-seeking among your people with depression: a qualitative study
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The article presents an interesting and original research related with depression in adolescents
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Methods are appropriate and well described.
3. Are the data sound?
Results are important, relevant and may help other researchers to find out some intervention strategies to provide early treatment for this high risk depression population.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The way results are presented can be improved.
Table 1 can be titled as “Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample”. Percentages can also be added in each column so readers can easily make a picture of the sample as a whole.
Table 2 can be arranged also. Reasons for avoidance professional help can be order from the most important to the less (higher frequencies to the lower one, and also percentages can also be added to each column).
Particularly statistical values are better expressed in the same table so the reader can easily evaluate results in a glance. Statistical analysis of the OR can be added to table 1, in the lower part.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
In order the text can have certain gender perspective balance some theoretical review about women’s treatment barriers can be added. Authors wrote about men stating “dominant cultural model of masculinity there is less tolerance for vulnerability, emotional fragility is deemed unacceptable…” and so on. But what about women???
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes they are stated.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
It is not sufficiently clear.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The abstract appear to be sufficient

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Article’s writing need to be reviewed in detail. There are some important errors in style and some bad translations such as “Subject’s mother tongue” instead of subject’s mother native language. Perhaps these are translation problems.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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