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Dear editor-in-chief,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript entitled: "Anxiety symptoms and coping strategies in the perinatal period" by A. George, R. Luz, C. de Tychey, N. Thilly and E. Spitz, which we would like to submit after peer review.

According to the reviewer’s report, we have made considerable modifications, which we present in detail in this letter.

**Concerning the “major compulsory revisions”**

After discussion and analysis of the pros and cons, we decided to present both ante- and postnatal data, because we are convinced that the longitudinal design provides more information than a cross-sectional design. In addition, given that additional time has passed, we are now able to present a larger population, since the study was continued since January (first submission).

1: Prevalence rates have been re-calculated: In the antenatal period, the prevalence rate in our population is 18.8% (74/394). 400 women answered our questionnaire, but 6 women did not answer the HAD-A scale concerning anxiety.

2: Missing data is now detailed in the results, which explains the differences between the number of women answering the questionnaire (our population) and the number of women listed in the Table.

3: The high dropout rates are now reported as limitations.

4: We have included additional information regarding the population in the postnatal period in order to ensure consistency.

5: Our initial formulation was misleading; every woman received the written information regarding psychological consulting, regardless of her anxiety score. This was in order to help women with psychological distress. The sentence has been corrected accordingly.

6: Brief and further information regarding coping has now been added.

7: Done.

8: We performed further analysis between responders vs. non-responders and there was no difference between the groups.

9: The discussion and conclusion have been completely revised in order to be more focused on the findings and clinical implications of the paper, as suggested.
Concerning the “minor essential revisions”

1: done
2: done
3: done
4: done
5: the table was revised accordingly
5a: F values and degrees of liberty are now reported
5b labels indicating the comparison are now reported
6: discussion has been reorganised accordingly, as suggested
6a: key message: done
6b: clinical implications are discussed
6c: strengths and limitations are reported

We thank you for your consideration of this work and your comprehension for our waiver and delay requests. Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to my University of Lorraine coordinates below. Please feel free to correspond with me by e-mail (astrid.george@voila.fr) or contact me by phone (0033-623431452) if needed.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Astrid George,

PHD student,

University of Lorraine- Metz
Research affiliation EA 4360 APEMAC-EPSAM
Ile du Saulcy BP 30309
57006 METZ Cedex 1
France

Telephone : + (33) 6 23 43 14 52
Fax : + (33) 3 87 31 57 83
E-mail: astrid.george@voila.fr