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**Author’s response to reviews:**

We thank all the Reviewers for their valuable feedback and taking the time to provide useful comments to improve our manuscript entitled “Prevalence of depression and its associated sociodemographic factors among Iranian Female Adolescents in Secondary Schools”.

Based on the constructive comments the following changes have been made:
It is necessary to explain that the corrections considered by honorable reviewers specified with the blue highlight in the text of the manuscript.

Response to Reviewer 1 – Dr Raul Navarro:

1) I am still not convincing about the theoretical stance followed to select the variables associated with depression. Authors should include a strong rationale about the socio-demographic variables selected not only based in previous studies. A theoretical framework is necessary to justify our elections and built knowledge.

Response: Thanks for the valuable comments of the reviewers that helped to improve the details of the study. A theoretical framework were explained in the end of the Background section, line 115-125, page 5.

In addition, explanations about limitations of not permission to ask some socioeconomic factors associated with depression in Iranian schools were added to the Method section line 179-183, page 8 and Limitation section at line 355-356, page 15.

2) Despite the reasons offered by authors, I am still not sure why male participants were neglected. For example, regarding practical implications it would be useful to include gender comparisons about the risk and protective factors related to depression. At least, authors should acknowledge among their limitations that they not have a diverse sample in terms of gender.

Response: According to the valuable advice of the honorable reviewer, the phrase “In addition, this study cannot be generalized to the entire community because it have not a diverse sample in terms of gender” was added to the limitations section, lines 358-359, page 15.

3) If the questionnaires were administered during regular hours in classrooms, male participants were invited to leave the classroom or schools selected were single-sex (female).

Response: To answer this comment, explanations were provided at the beginning of the Method section, lines 134-136, page 6.
4) Hypothesis are writing in present simple, future is more adequate if we consider that hypothesis are hypothetical results not current results.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer comment; corrections were made according reviewer comment.

5) Authors should explain why r2 values are not reported in table 2 considering they conducted multiple regressions analyses and we should know what proportion of the depression variance is explained by the sociodemographic variables included.

Response: To answer this comment, explanations were provided at the end of the Result section, lines 234-235, page 10. In addition, r2 values reported in table 2.

Response to reviewer 2:

1- The authors addressed reviewer concerns adequately. This article is quite interesting and will generate some interest among researchers and practitioners. I am suggesting emphasizing more of the implications of the results in this article.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer comment; more of the implications of study results were provided at the end of the Conclusion section, lines 394-399, page 16.