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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The manuscript addresses an important topic, that is the evaluation of the prevalence of depression and its associated sociodemographic factors among Iranian female adolescents attending secondary schools. The study was approved by the local ethics committee. The sampling procedure is fine, and the response rate is high.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

I feel that the author(s) did not provide justification for the research. The rationale should stem from the outcome of the literature review in the Introduction section. For instance, it is not clear to me why the focus was on female students only? It is true that girls can experience higher rates of depression compared with boys in adolescence, but the difference is not so important to exclude male participants. Another example is that each of the probable risk factors associated with depression are not even mentioned in the Introduction section. It is important to explain why it is crucial the assessment of those specific risk factors. In brief, it is important to provide the context and set the stage for the aims of the study in such a way as to show its necessity and importance.

In the abstract it reads "Depression as an important health problem is totally unknown among adolescents in Iranian society." Do you have any data that support this statement? Some research on depression has been carried out among adolescents in Iranian society.

It is important to provide information on the internal consistency of the CES-D for the current study.

A Statistical analysis subsection may be added.
That half of the sample is affected by severe depression is difficult to believe. I think it is better to repeat the analysis. Mean, standard deviation, range of CES-D scores are missing.

Did the author(s) take into account missing data in the CES-D? Usually, if more than four questions are missing answers, the score of the CES-D questionnaire is not considered valid.

Moreover, it says that "Each items were scored from 0 to 3 on the basis of 'how often have you felt this way during the past week', 0 - rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day), 1 - some or a little of 130 the time (1 - 2 days), 2 - occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3 - 4 days), and 3 - most or all of the time (5 - 7 days)." However, the CES-D includes positive questions: the scoring is exactly the same except that it is reversed: "Most or all of the time" is scored 0 points, "Rarely or none of the time" is scored 3 points, etc.

Theoretical and practical implications of the study findings were not satisfactorily addressed.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

See comments above

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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