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Reviewer's report:

Review: Self-Reported Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale is a useful evaluative tool in Major Depressive Disorder

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, clearly stated.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes. I would include in the discussion a sentence on their thoughts on whether the fact that the patient version always went first made a difference (i.e., order effects; was counterbalancing necessary?).

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, except that they say the divergence between self report and clinician in this study shows they are measuring different things. An alternative explanation is that the patient report is not equivalent to the clinician report. They should provide this as an alternative explanation. In this way, I would cite work by others done comparing other versions of the self report MADRS to clinician, who found high correlations (e.g., Mundt JC, Katzelnick DJ, Kennedy SH, et al. Validation of an IVRS version of the MADRS. J Psychiatr Res 2006;40:243-246)

I would also include in the discussion (or the intro) prior work done by the authors of the MADRS (i.e., Asberg) comparing the self report MADRS to the BDI (Svanborg & Asberg, J Affec Dis, 64, 2001, p. 203-216).

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, except as previously stated.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes, though I would include in the intro a mention of the self-report HAMD (via computer and paper-pencil). There is a whole decade worth of research on this, and it is widely used in research (especially by pharma). Here are cites:


8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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