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Reviewer’s report:

The Authors made an interesting review on the S3 guidelines and a even larger critics on the guidelines in general. It is surely interesting. However, some point should be addressed in order to make the message stronger and more efficacious.

1) The entire structure of the paper should be revised. It is not easy for the reader to understand how the paper was thought and the general structure of it. I suggest to use a classic structure: Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusion. It would help the reader to better understand the meaning of the paper. I would put all the results found in the results section and all the authors' comments and interpretations in the discussion section. Moreover, it would be very important at least to mention that there are alternative treatment for depression, even severe depressions, such as ECT (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23212054) or TMS (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22827578). Please, see and modify accordingly. Put this consideration in the discussion.

2) English language should be revised.

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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