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Reviewer's report:

Major concerns have been addressed. Some minor concerns still include discussion of the results of the statistical analysis and clinical relevance.

Maintain a consistent format for reporting results of comparisons, if significantly different, something like "patients with ___ showed significantly higher/lower/more favorable/less favorable remission than patients with ______, (regression coefficient β = __; Odd’s ratio = ___; 95% confidence interval: _____; p = ____; corrected p = ____). If comparisons were not significant different, simply say they were "not significantly different" or "not different" and report the values with "(regression coefficient β = __; Odd’s ratio = ___; 95% confidence interval: _____; p = ____; corrected p = ____)" or refer to the appropriate table.

If comparisons were not significantly different after correction, they can't be said to be more or less favorable, higher or lower. There are cases here where comparisons may be underpowered to detect clinically relevant differences that have been shown in other publications, please discuss this in the discussion and limitations. Discuss the results of any power calculations that have been done. It is likely the case that there are more than several subtypes of depression that are themselves.

Nevertheless, it is important to report on adequately powered results of well-run, negative or positive. I appreciate the work that has gone into refining this manuscript.

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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