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Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Thanks for both Reviewers’ very constructive comments! We revised this manuscript accordingly and changes in this revised manuscript were highlighted in blue.

Responses to Reviewer #2:

- **Major Compulsory Revisions**

  Comment 1: “Do not report the p values in either the abstract or the main body. Some reviewers would accept them in the tables. The presentation should always be the OR and 95% Confidence Interval. It can be represented as (OR 2.0; 95%CI 1.5-2.4) for example. Confidence intervals are now accepted as far more meaningful than p values.”
  
  Response: thanks for your suggestions! We followed your suggestions and reported 95% Confidence Interval accordingly rather than reporting p values in this revised manuscript.

  Comment 2: “I do not think Figure I is necessary. You could report the mean, median, skew and kurtosis in the results without using the figure”
  
  Response: we deleted Figure 1 accordingly, and reported the Mean, Median, Skew and Kurtosis in the results verbally in this revised manuscript.

  Comment 3: “You have reported several OR less than 1. Those OR are protective of depressive symptoms. For example on page 13 paragraph 1 you state “psychosocial risk factors include …. Pregnancy pressures (OR=0.92) and low social support (OR=0.92). They are protective not risk factors. There are two possible approaches to handling this. You could use the OR that you have reported but split the narrative into 1) the following predictors were protective and 2) the following were risk factors.”
  
  Response: thanks for your suggestions. We followed your suggestions and presented the data by reporting protective factors first, then followed by reporting significant risk factors in the revised manuscript.

  Comment 4: “My preference would be to change the way they are coded or which one you use as the indicator in the categorical function of Logistic Regression. That way all the OR can be greater than 1. But you will need to change the text so you are clear that “poor partner relationship” is a risk factor as opposed to “partner relationship” is protective. Are you using the categorical function in SPSS binary logistic regression? (Check that you have moved all the binary and categorical predictor variables into the categorical box and set their indicators correctly before running the regression).”
  
  Response: thanks, we followed the way you suggested and changed relevant text for clearly presenting the data. In addition, data analysis was double checked by a statistician.
Comment 5: “Having said that, it is very strange that “low social support” is protective. This needs checking (speaking from personal experience) and if the result is true it will need to be analysed in the discussion”.
Response: in this revised manuscript, we reported the protective factors and risk factors separately, social support is a protective factor (OR=0.92, 95% CI 0.88-0.97).

Comment 6: “Page 13 paragraph 3. Being young is protective (OR=0.85). Hence it is not in contrast but rather consistent with previous research”.
Response: thanks. We revised it as “consistent with…” in this revised manuscript.

Comment 7: “Page 14 paragraph 2. You state that active coping strategies and social support are protective. Yes they are but this is where it is important to be consistent with page 13 paragraph 1 “low social support (OR=0.92)”.
Response: as followed your suggested approaches, we have rewrote the paragraph 1 at page 13: reporting protective factor first and followed by reporting risk factors. In this revised manuscript, the result section and discussion section were presented and discussed far more clearly.

- **Minor Essential Revisions**

8. Page 4 line 17 – remove the word solid
Response: thanks, we removed this word accordingly.

9. Page 7 line 3 change consists to consisted
Response: thanks, we corrected it accordingly.

10. Page 7 line 18 change suggested to proposed
Response: we revised it accordingly.

11. Page 8 line 9 – tell the reader what reliability coefficients were used and their results as elsewhere.
Response: we added the type of reliability rest of “internal consistency coefficients”, we also added other reliability such as test-retest reliability results from other research. (Smillie LD, et al.: Personality and the bipolar spectrum: normative and classification data for the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 2009; 50(1): 48-53.)

12. Page 11 line 16 these are predictor or independent variables and it is very confusing if you call them outcomes.
Response: thanks for your suggestion! We revised outcomes as predictors in this revised manuscript.

13. Table 1 – first three variables are very confusing with the ?range included.
Response: Sorry for the confusion! In this revised manuscript, we removed the range scores.
Overall, we have responded and addressed the Reviewers’ comments well in this revised manuscript.
Very grateful!
And thanks for your kind reconsiderations!