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Major Compulsory Revisions

Title
The title seems ok to me, although I prefer to have some result in the title.

Abstract
The Abstract is too long, especially the part before the Aim.
Furthermore the Abstract accurately conveys what has been found.

Research question
The Research Question as posed by the authors in the Abstract is well defined; in the Introduction this RQ is lacking fully. It is unclear what the authors want to explore.

Methods
Sample
I do not understand the sentence: … premier, tertiary care hospital in Colombo … Please clarify (more hospitals? One hospital? Why then premier? Similar question for … of National Hospital of Sri Lanka …)

Measures
How was the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale translated into the local language? Please go into this.

Statistical analyses
This para is appropriate and well described.

Data
In my opinion it is not necessary to repeat in the text what is already in the table, especially Table 1. On the other hand data should not be mentioned in the text without having them mentioned in the table without mentioning ‘(data not shown)’ in the text.

This also means that the text of the Results section can be condensed considerably.

Please indicate where Table 1 and Table 2 should be placed in the text. Before Table 1 only text which is related to Table 1; before Table 2 only text related to Table 2. Please restructure the Results section.

Discussion and conclusions

For the reader: please repeat the aim of the study in the very first line of the Discussion and then please give the condensed answers.

Please discuss more in depth how it is possible that what you state in the Introduction (there is a difference between Western countries and Asia) appears not to be true.

Perhaps condense the discussion (as it is too long), and where possible relate to Western-Asian differences.

Strengths and Limitations

Please add a separate heading, and start this para with the study’s strengths. What you did not do, but what should be done is not a Limitation, but an Implication (for further research). What should be mentioned in the limitations is the way of sampling, the way of collecting information, and potential confounders.

A para on Implications discussing the finding’s relevance for practice and policy and the recommendations for future research should follow the para on Strengths and Limitations.

Writing

The English should be checked by a native speaker.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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