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Reviewer’s report:

No comments for the abstract or introduction.

In the methods section, did the intervention group receive care as usual PLUS the intervention, or only the intervention? If just the intervention, how come?

On page 9, line 22 what does 3+2 days mean? I was confused by lines 47 to 49. What do you mean by "an instrument in connection with the regular telephone call"?

On page 11, under the statistical analysis section, why weren't other demographics adjusted for such as SES or rural/urban status?

In the results section, is there an explanation for why some participants were lost to follow-up? What measures were taken to follow-up with these participants?

On page 12, do you have any explanation for the differences between intervention and control non-participants?

On page 13 lines 27-31, what was frequency of antidepressant medication in control group reduced to?

Sick leave and return to work is discussed and used as evidence for the effectiveness of the intervention. Was there any measure ensuring that sick leave was due to the depression and not another medical condition?

On page 14, the authors discuss patient perceptions about the intervention. Who asked these questions? If the person asking was highly involved in the intervention, they might have biased patient response.

In the discussion, the results are somewhat overstated. For example on page 14, line 25 the authors write that there was "significant reduction of depression". It is important that they specify that this is based on MADRS score and not BDI score.

On page 16 and the first half of page 17 I noticed a lot of awkward phrasing and weird sentences. For example at the end of the second line, I would say "support for the depressed patient THROUGH organizational changes"
Also on page 16, the word "also" on line 20 is misplaced and should be moved in front of the word "strongly".

In the paragraph beginning with "Recently," there are many awkward wordings and superfluous words.

The tables and figures look good, however Figures 2a,b,c, and 3 should include titles. They should also include significance levels.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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