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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I feel it is an important area to research and I was interested in the methodology of the study. Reading the manuscript I did find some issues and I will address these now.

My criticism with the methodology was the measurement of the EPDS. In the abstract and in the main body of the manuscript you only focus on the postnatal EPDS done at the end of the study and it wasn't until line 152 that it is mentioned the EPDS was done in the initial psychosocial assessment. I would think that a comparison between EPDS scores pre and post intervention (or no intervention) would be reported on and also it should be mentioned that pre and post were done rather than just post, especially in the abstract and with the sentence in line 94.

The language doesn't always have consistency. For example in line 142 you refer to 'mothers', line 144 'patients', line 146 'participants' and line 147 'women'. For clarification and consistency it would be best to stick to one or two terms, not four. I suggest women and participants and not to use mothers and patients to ensure women-centered language.

Line 156 you discuss the multidisciplinary support meetings but it is unsure if all the women had these or just the intervention group. This needs further clarification.

Line 235 - I think you need to be clearer with the aims of the study, is it to reduce EPDS? If so you also need to report on pre EPDS as suggested above. Are you stating that those in the intervention group would have a lower EPDS due to the intervention or due to increased monitoring or is the intervention and increased monitoring better at picking up those with a high EPDS. This needs clarification.

The discussion reads more like a results section as there is very little discussion linking the findings of this study to other current research, rather it justifies the significance of the current study alone. I think the discussion needs to review these results to current research on this topic to highlight any similarities and differences and to show where this study adds to the body of knowledge in this field.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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