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RE: MS: 1922355904978399 Cortical Thickness in Youth with Major Depressive Disorder

To the Editor:

We have revised the manuscript in accordance with the reviewers’ suggestions and feel it is a stronger paper. Below are detailed replies to each point.

Thank you for your consideration,
Frank P. MacMaster, PhD
Cuthbertson and Fischer Chair in Paediatric Mental Health
403-955-2784
fmacmast@ucalgary.ca

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS
Reviewer #1 (Cullen)
We appreciate the reviewer’s consideration of the manuscript and appreciate her input. We believe the suggestions have made for a stronger paper overall.

1. Thank you for clarifying that the approach was to focus on 2 regions, the DLPFC and the ACC. Please state this not only in the methods but also in the aims of the paper.

We have corrected that in the aims.

2. The tricky thing about this paper is that FreeSurfer does not have a region called DLPFC, so the authors are obliged to use the MFG, and say that this is "an aspect of the DLPFC". It's unfortunately a bit clumsy. I suggest using DLPFC in the introduction and discussion, as they have, and within the methods and results, explain once that MFG is the best available ROI within FreeSurfer that approximates DLPFC, and then just refer to MFG within those two sections.

We have corrected that throughout the manuscript.

3. FreeSurfer has two ACC regions, rostral and caudal, I think the authors used caudal but it is not always clear. Please state this clearly in the methods, which exact regions were used in the analysis.
We have corrected that throughout the manuscript.

4. Clarify that you used 4 regions: right and left caudal ACC, right and left MFG.
This would perhaps help readers understand how you came up with the p<0.01 threshold.

We have corrected that throughout the manuscript.

5. Since you have decided to focus only on ACC and DLPFC/MFG, please delete the results about precentral and isthmus.

We deleted that section.

6. Throughout the introduction and discussion, since the findings in this paper contrast with other reports, it would be good to always say the direction of findings; instead of saying 'differences', please state thicker or thinner, larger or smaller. Also please include left and right specifiers when possible.

We have done so whenever possible.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS
Reviewer #2 (Smith)
We appreciate the reviewer’s consideration of the manuscript and appreciate her input.