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Dear Editor,

RE: Manuscript titled: Suicidal ideation and associated factors among school-going adolescents in rural Uganda

Reviewer: Gustavo Turecki
Reviewer's report:
The authors have appropriately addressed the comments I previously made
What next?: Accept without revision
Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interest.

Our response: We thank the reviewer for their time in reviewing our manuscript. We are happy with the report.

Reviewer: Esben Agerbo
Reviewer's report:
General
Still a clear and short paper

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The authors should have been more systematic when amending errors in table 1. Neither the percentages nor the counts in the rows labelled “Worry” and “Loneliness” can be correct. The total percentage should be in-between the two percentages for males and females; more than 6500 out of 1506 have worries. In rows labelled ‘drinking’, the ‘no-row’ seems okay, as 1071=553+518, but there is an error in the ‘yes-row’, as 380<<200+501. I only checked table 1 very superficial, but please be less careless when you check it.
I am curious to know whether the weighting factor makes any difference, perhaps the authors could add a comment.

Our response: We have checked the Table and made corrections to the errors. This largely had resulted from transcribing process from computer output to the table. The table report presents unweighted values. We thank the reviewer for this observation.

I would have expected that the authors had used a sandwich or robust covariance estimator – perhaps the authors could add a reference.

Our response: our understanding is that the robust covariance estimator may be appropriate as in setting where data are spare. They may improve the efficiency
of the estimates in such situations but may not result in appreciable gains otherwise. We accept the robust covariance estimator is one of the many options we could have used but did not. We do not feel there is need for a reference to the robust covariance estimator when we did not choose such an approach i.e. we considered how we may use such a reference so as to be informative and useful. We have not been able to see how effective we could do that. We believe we used acceptable and justifiable methods of data analysis and reported for a survey of the design that we used.

Thank you.

Adamson S. Muula