Reviewer’s report

Title: Patterns of psychotropic medicine use in pregnancy in the United States from 2006 to 2011 among women with private insurance

Version: 6 Date: 27 May 2014

Reviewer: Anne Buist

Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written paper covering an important topic, thought here is a number of articles and reviews looking at this in various ways. The strength is the numbers but there are a number of weaknesses, not all of which have been commented on. They describe well the removal of women with once only filled scripts and this ensures the numbers are (wisely) conservative.

Minor Essential

They do say that this population may not be transferable to the general population which is correct but they need also to comment on the ICD-9 diagnosis being, I presume clinical (or is it an admin person) and not a diagnostic interview and done by multiple people with different training and reliability. Can they please comment on why only half had a diagnosis at all that was relevant?

Why didn’t they include mood stabilisers (lithium, sodium valproate, lamotrigine)?
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