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Reviewer's report:

In my opinion the manuscript has improved. It can definately be considered for publication when some final additional information has been added:

Minor essential revisions:

- The authors state that 'studies have showed that a differential monetary loss of 20-25% has been found between patients treated for depression versus the untreated'. I could not find the reference (they state this in the methods and again in the discussion), but maybe I have overlooked it. If not, they should add the reference.

I also still feel that the authors should add a few more references to show that their findings from the cost analysis are in line with other studies.

- In their reply to my first comment the authors state that 'exclusion of those with pre-existing depression would only make the point prevalence estimates conservative'. I do not understand what they mean because in their methods section they state: 'Patients who had pre-existing depression (...) were excluded.' Were these patients excluded or not? Please clarify!

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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