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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsray 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.

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

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

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.

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.

6. Concerning the results of sensitivity and specificity (p. 12) of two different cut offs (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 higher (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.

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.

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

9. The letter s for the Std Error in Parentheses of the EPDS Score for moderate depressive symptoms is missing (p. 10)
10. P-value for point a in page 10 is probably <0.005 instead of <0.004 (recheck pls.)

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

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


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 it's 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)

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

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

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

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 elswhere, 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.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests