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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is focused on the effect of education on the use of mental health services but it is not explained why the authors limited their interest to the effect of education. Since the presented results provide information on a broad spectrum of variables which are also of interest I would suggest the authors to widen the scope of the paper by using a more general title and extending the introduction and the discussion to consider the role of other variables relevant for mental health service use.

The authors use a large data base to analyse factors affecting the use of mental health services by people with depressive symptoms.

Depressive symptoms are assessed by a single item which contains standardized criteria of depression but does not provide a valid basis for a DSM or ICD diagnosis.

It would be also interesting to analyse the use of mental health consultation in the whole population sample. This could be used as an indicator of the criteria validity of the assessment of depressive symptoms.

It is not clear if the study was approved by an ethical committee.

No information on the overall fit of the logistic regression model is provided. The authors should present a Pseudo R-square or any other model fit parameter. No information is provided on missing values and the final sample size included in the logistic regression model.

The parameters differences in the subgroup analyses are not statistically tested.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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