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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

General

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.

Results

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.

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.

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).

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.

Discussion

6. Page 13 paragraph 3. Being young is protective (OR=0.85). Hence it is not in contrast but rather consistent with previous research.

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)

- Minor Essential Revisions
8. Page 4 line 17 – remove the word solid
9. Page 7 line 3 change consists to consisted
10. Page 7 line 18 change suggested to proposed
11. Page 8 line 9 – tell the reader what reliability coefficients were used and their results as elsewhere.
12. Page 11 line 16 these are predictor or independent variables and it is very confusing if you call them outcomes.
13. Table 1 – first three variables are very confusing with the ?range included.
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