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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We thank you again for this new review process which permit us to propose you an now improved version of the manuscript.

The manuscript has been sent to our native English professional editor who has carefully edited the manuscript.

Response to reviewer Janet William:

We agree with the reviewer about the interview guide is an instruction manual and not a semi-structured interview, this is now modified.

Response to reviewer Antonio Lobo (and to Glenn Alexander Melvin)

a/ we have included these two more points in the limitations part of the discussion section:
"First, only five adolescents were interviewed in the qualitative phase, this may be considered as a small number, even if a saturation of the verbatim collected appeared at this stage. Second, the sample under study was made up of psychiatric and medical outpatients or inpatients at multiple sites, even if this heterogeneity may be interesting in terms of generalisability, it may be criticised on scientific grounds."

(b/ and c: no comments required)

d/ The fact that the work has been done in France is now explicit in the abstract

e/ comments to points 6/ to 10:

6/ There are already 2 tables containing each 3 series of factor loadings, we don't believe that a new one concerning the whole sample would be useful. We agree, the justification for conducting 2, 3 and 4 factor analyses could be misunderstood, since it was not of a major importance, this sentence has been discarded (and only the 2 factors solution is now discussed). About the proportion of variance explained it is available in the paper.

7/ We don't agree with the reviewer, since the confirmatory factor analysis is a multiple sample comparison of factor analyses loadings there is no circularity.

8/ Since the study is not an epidemiological study, we have not detailed prevalence of depression in each subgroups. We think that such results could make the paper difficult to read. Details of why items were excluded were
presented at the end of page 7. It sounds that the explanation was not clear enough, it has been modified.

10/ These correlations are superior indeed:
CGI/ADRSi = 0.8 > CGI/HDRS=0.74 (significant, bootstrap test taking into account that the sample is the same for both computations of correlation)
CGI/ADRSi = 0.52 > CGI/HDRS=0.48 (significant, bootstrap test taking into account that the sample is the same for both computations of correlation)

The test used for the comparison of the correlations was not detailed, it is now presented in the manuscript.