**Reviewer’s report**

**Title:** Determinants of antenatal depression and postnatal depression in Australia

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 18 Dec 2017

**Reviewer:** Gracia Fellmeth

**Reviewer’s report:**

Many thanks for this revised version of the manuscript. I have only a small number of comments remaining:

1. The way in which the EPDS was administered (i.e. whether the English version was administered via an interpreter or whether women self-completed in a translated version of their choice) is still not clear. This issue was raised by another reviewer in the previous round of comments and I agree it is an important point. This has not been addressed by the authors.

2. The distribution of risk factors among CALD vs. non-CALD populations is important. Given the conclusions drawn that depression is more common in CALD populations, the immediate assumption is that this is because risk factors such as IPV are more common among this group. The authors have partially addressed this by saying IPV prevalence did not differ significantly. This finding is surprising and perhaps warrants some discussion. I also think it would be important to look more systematically at the distribution of other risk factors. Given that the focus of this research is to compare CALD and non-CALD populations, a table outlining the prevalence of exposure variables by CALD-status would be helpful at the start of the results section before moving on to prevalence of the outcome (depression).

Other than this minor recommendation this is an interesting and well-presented piece of research.
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