Author’s response to reviews

Title: Assessment of anxiety-depression levels and perceptions of quality of life in adolescents with dysmenorrhea

Authors:

Nilfer Şahin (nilfersahin@hotmail.com)
Burcu Kasap (burcuharmandar@mu.edu.tr)
Ulviye Kırlı (ulviyeucar@gmail.com)
Neşe Yeniçeri (neseyeniceri@mu.edu.tr)
Yaşar Topal (yasartopal@mu.edu.tr)

Version: 1 Date: 27 Dec 2017

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank to editorial of Reproductive Health and external reviewer for their instructive and insightful critics regarding our manuscript entitled “Assessment of anxiety-depression levels and perceptions of quality of life in adolescents with dysmenorrhea”. We showed all changes in black bold. If there is still something requiring revision, we will be happy to do so.

Warm Regards

Nilfer Sahin, MD
Reviewer: 1

Comments:

In my opinion, this is a well-written paper on a clinically relevant topic. The study design appears appropriate. The description of the methodology and the presentation of the results are generally sound.

However, there are several issues which need to be revised before the paper should be published.

1. In methods, the sentence includes the term "17 items" which should be changed to "27 items".
   Answer 1: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The 17 items that were mistakenly written in the material method were changed to 27 items.

2. How the severity of dysmenorrhea and the level of academic achievement were determined. This should be specified in the method.
   Answer 2: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. It was explained in the material method how the academic achievement levels and the severity of dysmenorrhea of the cases was classified.

3. The sex of the control group should be added.
   Answer 3: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The sex of the control group was added as ‘adolescent girls’.

4. The r values for the p value and the correlation must be written in the results.
   Answer 4: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The r and p values of the correlations are added in the results for the significant results. The p and r values were not
given for the statistically insignificant findings due to the large number of correlations, it was summarized in the table.

5. The PedsQL, STAI-T, STAI-S and CDI scores and p values between the two groups should be specified in the results

Answer 5: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The PedsQL, STAI-T, STAI-S and CDI scores and p values between the two groups were specified in the results.

6. The lack of the psychiatric examination and a semi-structured interview is a limitation of working. This situation should be mentioned as a limitation.

Answer 6: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The sentence of ‘The lack of the psychiatric examination and a semi-structured interview was evaluated as one of the major limitations of our study’ was added in discussion.

7. Please consider rephrasing one sentence (In our study, the finding of higher anxiety and depression scores in cases with dysmenorrhea suggests that dysmenorrhea itself impairs mental health; however, when the presence of dysmenorrhea was assessed in cases with high depression and anxiety scores, the likelihood of dysmenorrhea was found to be higher in cases with depression) in the discussion. This sentence includes the term "depression" which should be changed to "high depression scores".

Answer 7: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The sentence was corrected as: In our study, the finding of higher anxiety and depression scores in cases with dysmenorrhea suggests that dysmenorrhea itself impairs mental health; however, when the presence of dysmenorrhea was assessed in cases with high depression and anxiety scores, the likelihood of dysmenorrhea was found to be higher in cases with high depression scores.
8. Some references should be rearranged according to the rule of the journal.

Answer 8: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The references were rearranged according to the rule of the journal.

9. Limitations of the study should be written.

Answer 9: Thanks for your comments. I agree with your instructive critics. The limitations of the study were discussed more broadly in discussion.