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Dear Dr Hesse:

We thank you for accepting our manuscript, “Epidemiologic heterogeneity of common mood and anxiety disorders over the lifecourse in the general population: a systematic review”, for publication in BMC Psychiatry. We discuss below our responses to the reviewers’ comments, which we believe have further improved the manuscript. Thank you once again for your continued interest in our manuscript.

REVIEWER 1

“consider summarizing methodological points in one or more tables (e.g., a table containing predictors of trajectories that have been identified in a substantial proportion of studies; a table of statistical models with some comments on strengths and weaknesses)"

Reviewer 1, similar to Reviewer 2, suggested the manuscript would benefit from greater summarization of the similarities across studies and identification of our most robust findings. Consistent with the suggestion of Reviewer 2, we have included additional text in the Discussion section of the manuscript that is intended to integrate the results of the review and identify our most robust findings. For example, in the second paragraph of the Discussion we have extended the description of our findings about atypical depression (the subtype most commonly identified by latent class analyses in our review) and placed these findings within a broader context. Similarly, in paragraph four of the Discussion, we now comment on the most prevalent trajectories of depressive symptoms and highlight important differences between studies.

REVIEWER 2

“I strongly encourage the authors to add a few sentences summarizing the major similarities across studies after the presentation of the results describing both cross-sectional and longitudinal data on depression, which are based on multiple studies.”
As described above in our response to Reviewer 1, we have revised the Discussion section of the manuscript by highlighting the major similarities across studies.

We hope that these revisions have adequately addressed the reviewers’ comments. We include with this letter a copy of the revised manuscript. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sandro Galea, MD, DrPH
sgalea@umich.edu