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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. In the results section of the abstract, sentence beginning, “Compared to women…” should be split up into two sentences. The second sentence would begin, “Women reporting use of antidepressants…” Also, the final sentence beginning with, “Factors that were found…” is unclear because of the phrase, “compared to women without PMS or major depression only.” Rephrasing would improve clarity.

2. In the middle of the third paragraph of the introduction prior to references 23 and 23, the phrase “PMS and major depression” seems out of place. Possibly this was meant to be taken out in the revision.

3. In the Predictors for PMS/PMDD and/or major depression section of the results, PMDD should be taken out of the title. Also, the sentence in the middle of this paragraph should read something to the effect of, “Women taking oral contraceptives were at higher risk of suffering from major depression than women with none of the two conditions (reference group).”

4. In the Discussion, defining “reference group” once more would be beneficial to the reader.

5. In the second to last sentence of the Strengths and limitations section of the discussion, it should read, “PMS and major depression.” Also, in the last sentence, it should be “confounds” as opposed to “confounders.”

Minor Essential Revisions

1. In the Assessment of premenstrual syndrome section, you describe how severe PMS was assessed, but then you describe how moderate to severe PMS was assessed. Is the latter simply defining overall PMS status? If so, how did you classify moderate PMS?

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. In the “relationships and differences…” section of the results, p values are needed for significant differences. Also, in the last sentence, is this a significant difference from another group? Either way, this should be stated.
2. A more in depth interpretation of the finding is needed in the discussion section. This section seems to be more of a summary of the results and support from the literature as opposed to a discussion regarding the meaning and clinical implication of the findings. The former is necessary and the authors do it well, but the latter seems to be lacking. This is particularly true for the Differences in women with PMS and major depression section of the discussion. What do the results mean and why are they important?
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