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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. Results are given in Methods section, including a Table. These must be removed to Results.

2. The methodology lacks sufficient detail. How many different people read through each report, how were categories developed and agreed between researchers? It states that the stores were sorted into different main categories, but surely one 'story' may have had test which fell into multiple categories. How was this dealt with? How were quotations selected?

Why were reports translated into English after categories were developed and before analysis? (Or perhaps I have not understood the method correctly - if so it needs to be clearer.) Surely it would have been easier for researchers to work in Swedish. What effect would translation have on the quality of analysis?

3. The paper is too long for the amount of data presented, particularly the number of quotes from reports (see below) and the discussion. These need to be reduced.

4. The English is poor throughout and needs to be corrected, this includes the quotes used, which adds further to concerns that analysing text in a different language from that in which it was written may not have been appropriate (if indeed this is what happened).

Minor essential revisions


2. Methods page 5: not clear what selection criteria are referred to. This needs further information and clarification.

3. Discussion page 17 what is the 'ground rule' which states that newer antidepressants do not create dependency? Please clarify this term.

4. There is no mention at all of the major evaluation of patient reporting conducted in the UK, which is directly relevant to this work, and which reports work on patient experiences of ADRs to antidepressants and withdrawal reactions, plus negative experiences of health professionals when they seek to
discuss these experiences, and specifically highlights the importance of free text comments in adding richness to the impact of ADRs on peoples' lives. Given that these are the major conclusions of this study, it is essential that authors are at least aware of and cite other work which draws the same conclusions.

Discretionary revisions

1. It is common for qualitative studies to be reported with results and discussion combined, to enable the themes to be described in details, illustrated with quotations (usually few are required) and discussed along with the relevant literature. Authors may consider using this approach, to help in reducing the text overall, but the number of quotes and length of discussion particularly.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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