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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is somewhat stronger since the last time I reviewed it however before it is ready for publication I think more work needs to be completed on the results section as it lacks clarity.

Major Compulsory Revisions;

Abstract

I would not start the results section of the abstract with "A non-significant difference was noted..... " start with the results that are significant and then move to highlight important but non significant results.

Main body of paper Results Section

The presentation of the results is very confusing and some vital information is not included either in the text or in a Table, for example on page 11 paragraph 1 line 4, the p-value is presented with out a Chi value.

In Table 4 there are two p values presented for the difference between the post natal variables, for example, the first variable on depressive symptoms the EX group 11.11 (6.05) Vs CT Group 9.34 (5.18) P =0.08** 0.12*

NO t-scores results are given in these tables and I am not sure what the second p values refers to,

Consider presenting the results of mixed between-subjects analysis used to assess the impact of the intervention (ex group vs ct group) on depression in a Table or as Figure indicating the change over time.

The presentation of all the Tables should be standardised and conform to the APA guidelines or similar.

I think a little more information about the previous paper (Ref 50) that is referred to in this paper is warranted if they authors are going to comment on results from the previous paper in their current result section (see page 11 paragraph Covariate Analysis).

There should be some results presented on the fathers data which was collected in this study I do note however that fathers are discussed in the Discussion.
Minor Essential Revisions
please check this paper for typo's again

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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