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Reviewer's report:

#1. Defining an "inadequate response" was done based on the PGI-C. When we assess inadequate response in clinical trial, we usually implement HAM-D. Considering the study's characteristic, it was inevitable to use a subjective scale. Thus, please i) describe PGI-C in a more detailed and ii) the reason it was chosen among many scales available.

#2. The discussion section lacks comments about limitation. Addressing possible limitation is necessary because it provides an insight for future researcher when they want to replicate the study or perform similar researches.

#3. The study was conducted only in the western world, so it may be difficulty generalize the results. The authors should mention them in the limitation section

#4. The limitation of random forest analysis should also be addressed.

#5. In contrast to limitation, the authors did not emphasize the strength of this study. Were there similar studies in the past? If so, how are the present studies different from the previous ones. If no similar studies were done before, then the discussion should address this impact of the "new data."

#6. The authors cite same reference multiple times, which is not a proper way because readers may be confused with the core contents of the journal that you have cited. This problem may be solved by solving #5.

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.

Unable to assess
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 recommend additional statistical review

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