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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has the potential to make an important contribution to the literature, however I do have some suggestions that the authors may want to consider.

I think that the paper did not set up a convincing delineation of the incremental contribution the study makes to the extant empirical literature. I am not saying there isn't one there (indeed I think there is), but just that it needs to be more clearly articulated.

For example, although the research problem is informed by a review of the relevant empirical work, the critical issues is that the paper is not clear about the underpinning theoretical stance. Author/s should ensure that there is an explicit alignment and consistency between a theoretical stance and their approach. They should made it explicit in the introduction of the paper. The theoretical perspective should also serve to comment results in the discussion section.

Authors should also explain why they focus only on female students. They argued that previous studies have only focus on male students but authors need a rationale to not focus on female and male student and compare both sexes.

Literature review in the introduction is limited and also is limited in the discussion section. For example, authors have not reviewed studies about the association between depression and potential risk factors. Introduction should have a similar length that discussion, including a deeper literature review.

The objectives of the research need to be more clearly specified in the introduction section. Indeed, the introduction should end with clearly articulated expectations (hypotheses) that advance current knowledge and that drive the data analysis. Hypothesis should also be framed in theoretical and empirical background. Authors should explained in what information are based each hypothesis.

Participants: This section should be rewrite to improve readers understanding. In my opinion, author/s should include a discussion of the desired sample based on a power analysis, then the procedure used (i.e., who was contacted about participation), and finally the number of participants who were involved in the study. The final sample should be included in the sample description and not in the results section.
How many time did employ participants to complete the questionnaire? Did this happen during class time? Given the sensitivity of the questions how was anonymity and confidentiality conveyed and ensured? How long did the data collection process take overall? Were some of the questionnaires excluded for some reason? Where the interviews took place?

Discussion

Discussion is difficult to follow. The inclusion of hypothesis and subsections according to the hypothesis will improve the reading experience.

Authors should explain more clearly the practical implications of their study.

Given the cross-sectional nature of the study, language should be reviewed to avoid causal explanations.

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:
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