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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written manuscript that addresses a very important topic regarding designing peer telephone-based interventions. The information provided has the potential to be informative to researchers who hope to develop these types of interventions. However, there are some significant limitations that should be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Title: The title implies that multiple studies are discussed in the paper; however, the prevention of postpartum depression study is the primary study that is discussed. The breastfeeding trial is mentioned a few times but given most of the article appears (based on my reading of the article) to focus on the postpartum trial, the title should reflect this.

2) Abstract: Similar to the comment above, the abstract should reflect that most of the information is coming from the one postpartum depression prevention trial.

3) Abstract: The results that are discussed (i.e., the efficacy of the trial) are already published in another paper. Therefore, these results should not appear in the abstract. The abstract should instead reflect what is discussed in the paper, not the main outcomes of the overall trial. Also, the paper did not provide any data to support that the development and implementation of the peer support program is feasible and satisfactory to mothers in the paper and therefore, this should be deleted from the abstract.

4) Page 6: Please indicate if the peer volunteers were compensated. The term “volunteer” indicates they were not, but please clarify.

5) Page 14: The title includes the term “lessons learned.” Therefore, it would be helpful to include what you would do differently in future trials based on the lessons learned.

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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