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Author’s response to reviews:

Comment 1:

My primary concern is that the PRISMA protocol does not appear to have been adequately followed. The authors have inserted a data extraction table and refer to it as the PRISMA checklist. However, the PRISMA checklist is a specific document to be completed by authors to ensure that they have followed the PRISMA protocol. See http://prisma-statement.org/documents/PRISMA%202009%20checklist.pdf My recommendation is that the authors complete this table and include it as supplementary material.

Response:

We have completed the PRISMA checklist/ and included as supplementary material (Table).

We also made revisions as follows:
In the manuscript,

Inserted 2 sub-headings in the Method section of the manuscript. For descriptions, some phrases and sentences inserted. In addition, moved sentences from method and result sections to relevant sub-headings as follows:

Pg. 6-7, Selection of studies

In addition to implementing the search strategy, the reference lists of articles meeting inclusion criteria were searched to identify any studies that had not been found. In order to obtain copies of studies published in non-indexed or local journals, we corresponded with authors via email, if we did not receive a response we wrote to the editor of the journal. By learning the journal was no more published, we sought a copy of the publications through interlibrary loan.

Pg. 8, Collection of data and analysis

We extracted data from selected studies using data-extraction format (Table 1). Adherence to the 33 process-based criteria were organised into two sections: Culturally Sensitive Translation and Empirical Validation using three response options: Yes/Not mentioned/Not needed (Table 3-4). Narrative summary of evidence about adherence to the process-based criteria presented by three key aspects of LLV-EPDS development process: Culturally Sensitive Translation, Empirical Validation and Psychometric properties (meta-analysis was not done as was beyond our study objective). The data on process-based criteria and methodological quality were extracted by the first author and then rechecked by other authors; differences were resolved by consensus.

Table:

We have revised title of the Table 1 as “Studies included for systematic review on reliability and validity of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale in low- and lower-middle-income countries”.
Comment 2:

There remain numerous problems with the quality of the written expression. The article requires extensive editing for spelling and grammatical errors.

Response 2:

This article has been extensively edited for spelling and grammatical errors. Revisions are carried-out using track change in the Manuscript, the Figures and the Tables (For details please see these documents).

Comment 3:

There are four inclusion criteria listed in the method section but the PRISMA figure only refers to three. The reasons for excluding papers depicted in the Figure should map onto the criteria outlined in the method.

Response 3:

We followed four inclusion criteria mentioned in the methods section for screening records and full text articles. To reflect, we have inserted phrases in the Figure 2 as follows:

After reading the title and the abstract of the records, excluded these records which did not meet inclusion criteria (n = 1231)

Response 4:

If the list of EPDS items are not going to be provided in the manuscript, then when the article refers to a specific EPDS item, it would useful to put the wording of the item in brackets.
We fully agreed on reviewers comment provided on 1st Review

“Given that the authors refer to specific EPDS items by their number throughout the results section, it may be useful to provide readers with a table listing the original English-language EPDS items”

Thus, we have revised by

in the Pg. 3,

Background,

paragraph 2nd, in the end of second sentence inserted phrase (See Box 1)

Before 3rd paragraph, inserted Box1: Ten items of the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale [5]. (The texts are in red colour to indicate insertion)

Comment 5:

The manuscript would still benefit greatly from improving the clarity around the process-based criteria so it can be easily implemented by future translation studies. For example it is not clear what counts as an 'adequate sample size’?
Response 5:

To improve clarity, we revised definitions of Process-based criteria (Please see Box 3: Definitions of Process-based criteria).

Comment 6:

The numbering of the criteria is confusing - the subheading (e.g., Step 1) of each section is also numbered as if it is a criterion instead of a subheading. E.g., Step 1 involves 2 criteria - not 3. But it is referred to as criteria 1 - 3. Using numbering instead of dot points would make it easier to follow.

Response 6:

We have changed dot points by numbering (for each criterion) in Figure 1. In total there are now 33 review criteria.