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Reviewer's report:

Antenatal paternal stress, depression, and anxiety is an interesting health issue that would benefit from research such as that described by the authors. The results are potentially interesting.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Unfortunately, the study is not well served by the current manuscript. It was difficult to fully evaluate the merits of the study because it was not well explained. As a result, comments are limited to major substantive issues. As these are addressed, other issues might arise.

The introduction is challenging to read and does not adequately guide the reader to the central objective of the analyses conducted. For example, there are two paragraphs devoted to 1) instruments to assess depression and anxiety and 2) maternal depression and anxiety. It is unclear how this information is relevant to the aims of the manuscript.

There are grammatical and phrasing issues throughout the manuscript that impede readability. Consider the judicious use of commas and additional editing. There are typos throughout the manuscript (e.g., " on p. 7).

It is unclear how the introduction, as written, supports the objectives of the study as stated in the title of the manuscript. There is virtually nothing about intervention in the introduction but this appears to be a report on outcomes of an intervention study.

The description of the methods is inadequate. The descriptions of the study design and interventions are particularly weak and should be rewritten to provide more detail. The manuscript states that details have been reported elsewhere, but there is no citation.

Overall the results section is difficult to read and understand. For example, the results begin with what appears to be qualitative data from participants. Why is this presented first? The results are difficult to interpret as the study design was unclear. The last paragraph discusses limitations and appears to be more appropriate to include in a discussion.

The discussion was not fully evaluated as it was difficult to evaluate the design and results.
Having said all this, it seems entirely reasonable that the results of this project are publishable. However, the manuscript requires major substantive revisions and reorganization to highlight important findings, improve readability, and provide sufficient context for the reader to interpret results in light of current research on this topic.
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