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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes – well written paper

- Minor Essential Revisions:

1. The authors state on page 5 para 2 that there may be fewer practical barriers to treatment in the antenatal period but conversely state on page 6 para 1 that there are unique demands and barriers to a pregnant woman’s time. These statements seem contradictory. Could the authors justify the statement they have evidence for?

2. Can the authors explain what screen positive means? Ie is it saying yes to nay of the whooley questions or yes to all?

3. How did the authors rate the PHQ questions relating to somatic symptoms?

4. How many women booked into booking clinics in the recruitment period? i.e. 154 women were screen positive of how many women overall?

5. Could table 1 include the numbers and proportions with ICD10 diagnosis of mild, moderate and severe depression separately? The summary statistics of CIS-R scores do not provide enough information in this regard

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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