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Dear Madam/Sir,

We would like to thank you for your comments to this submission. We very much agree with the thrust of this feedback and we have now revised the manuscript in line with all of the specific comments by both Reviewers. We have responded as fully as possible to all of the Reviewers’ comments and believe we have successfully integrated all of their suggested revisions. The comments and questions raised by both reviewers together with our responses are listed below.

We hope that our responses and revisions are clear, complete and acceptable and we look forward to hearing from you. On behalf of my co-authors and myself,

Yours Sincerely,

Victoria Vivilaki (corresponding author)
**Reviewer 1: Charalabos-Markos Dintsios**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. *Clarify if the mothers were resident in Heraklion municipality as stated at the objectives (p. 5) or recruited from 4 hospitals of Heraklion municipality (p. 6, Participants), where obviously also women from other parts of Crete (rural) can deliver babies.*

We thank the reviewer for this comment and we have reworded our manuscript in Page 5. The participants were recruited from four hospitals of Heraklion municipality, where also women from other parts of Crete (rural) may deliver babies.

2. *Give an example for the cultural adaptation of the translated EPDS (p. 6).*

Thanks again, and we have added a paragraph about the cultural adaptation of the translated EPDS on page 6 of the revised manuscript.

3. *The CI for the mean EPDS score in the depressed mothers is missing (p. 10). For the non-depressed CI is presented.*

We have added the CI for the mean EPDS score in the depressed mothers in page 10.

4. *For the alpha value (0.804) at the top of page 11 a wrong CI is presented (0.228 - 0.366). This must be corrected.*

Thanks for your suggestion and we have corrected CI alpha value in page 11.

5. *For the results of criterion validity (p. 12) the AUC-ROC for moderate and severe depression is 0.902 with a CI that is exceeding 1 (0.801-1.003). The CI of a AUC-ROC should not exceed 1.*

We have also corrected CI as indicated by the reviewer (page 12 in the revised manuscript).

6. *Concerning the results of sensitivity and specificity (p. 12) of two different cutoffs (9/10: sens085.7%; spez67.9% and 12/13: sens87.5%; spez85.7%) the authors stated that: As the threshold score increases to the cut off score of 12/13 the model sensitivity lowers while model specificity reaches higher proportions. This statement is not confirmed by the results, because sensitivity is getting heigher (from 85.7% to 87.5%).*
Concerning the specificity the statement is correct (from 67.9% to 85.7%). The results have to be either recalculated or the statement has to be adapted according to the results.

Thank you for the important comment. We have erased the following sentence ‘A threshold score of 9/10 (sensitivity=85.7 and specificity=67.9) was found to identify all women with moderate or major depression diagnosis according to the BDI-II scale.’ This sentence refers to other study and not to ours and we have used it to the discussion. According to Table 7 as the threshold score increases to the cut off score of 12/13 the model sensitivity lowers while model specificity reaches higher proportions.

7. In the discussion chapter the results for the two factor structure are repeated. Authors should discuss the results but not present redundant passages in the discussion part. They can refer to the chapter Factor structure for the results.

We have changed the specific paragraph in the Discussion section, as indicated by the reviewer.

Minor Essential Revisions

8. AUC-ROC at abstract should be presented in a three-digit manner (0.747 instead of 0.7470)

We have changed AUC-ROC presented in three-digit manner.

9. The letter s for the Std Error in Parentheses of the EPDS Score for moderate depressive symptoms is missing (p. 10)

We accept this suggestion and we changed the manuscript accordingly.

10. P-value for point a in page 10 is probably <0.005 instead of <0.004 (recheck pls.)

We have rechecked the p-value as kindly requested. We include the output of SPSS 17 below for reviewer’s consideration. You can see different groups of mothers according to BDI-II with the following coding:

0= mothers with no depressive symptoms  
1=mothers with mild depressive symptoms  
2=mothers with moderate depressive symptoms
3=mothers with severe depressive symptoms

### Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-2.758</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6.314</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-9.28</td>
<td>-13.49</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-9.725</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-13.49</td>
<td>-5.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3.556</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-6.69</td>
<td>-10.86</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-6.967</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-10.86</td>
<td>-13.49</td>
<td>-5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.314</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.556</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.411</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-7.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.725</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.967</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

11. **P-value for point f in page 10 should be presented in his true value** (p=0.192)

We have presented p value, as kindly requested.

12. **factor explanation in page 11 48.97% instead of 48.970% (pseudo-accuracy)**

We have changed, the factor explanation, as kindly requested.

13. **Criterion validity add for sensitivity and specificity % -signs for the threshold score of 9/10 (p. 12).**

We have changed this point, as shown above.

14. **Check the statistical data for the results of Benvenuti again** (there is a p-Value nad than a sign in the same
parenthesis) (p. 13). Furthermore the p-value should be presented in its true value as p=0.397 instead of p<0.379, you should use < only for thresholds like 0.05 or 0.001 or 0.005 and so on)

We have changed the p-value as kindly requested.

15. **Table 3: Delete I for the last 4 questions at the left column**

We have deleted 'I' in the last 4 questions.

**Discretionary revisions**

16. **Background P. 5: Describe in short the profound effect of untreated postnatal depression. This trivial sentence is not purposeful for all the readers of the article**

We have added a sentence in page 5 with a short description of profound effect of untreated postnatal depression.

17. **Background P. 5: Name some literature for the well documented effect of untreated postnatal depression since it is well documented.**

We have added references regarding the effect of untreated postnatal depression.

18. **A discussion about the external validity of the results for the whole Greek mothers is missing. Due to the fact that Heraklion is located in Crete there could be some differences with the population in Athens or elsewhere, even heraklion is rather big. Furthermore the catchment area of the 4 hospitals is probably including urban and rural population, which may be affected in a different way concerning postnatal depression. Usually mothers age is lower in rural regions and postnatal depression is connected to age, education, occupation and support by the life partner.**

We agree with the reviewer’s comment and we have fully described limitations and integrated them into the Discussion of the revised manuscript in the last six sentences of the third paragraph.

**Reviewer 2: Wendy Sword**

Suggestions for improvement include some assistance with english phrasing and if possible a reduction in the numbers of separate tables/figures (could some be combined?) Note also for your interest
We would like to thank reviewer for all the above important suggestions and we have reduced the tables in the revised manuscript. Table 2 and Table 3 were erased and we added the last three sentences in first paragraph of sample characteristics. We tried to identify and correct all English phrasing errors.