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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 2 comments and responses:

(1) Minimal changes were made within the background section. The authors reported that they expanded this section with a few lines, but the rationale for assessing this population remains unclear. Although they briefly noted that no prior research has been conducted with this population, discussion of the unique factors that are associated with the sample (e.g., socio-cultural factors) is also needed. This point is particularly important given the high rate of positive depression screens reported in their results, as well as the points made in the discussion about the relevance of these factors.

- The socio – cultural basis of the importance of conducting this study in a local population has been added - page 4 line 1 to 8.

(2) Most methodological concerns were addressed. However, the authors did not include any information regarding the psychometric properties of their instruments or a sample item of their primary measure. Additionally, with regard to the sample size calculation, it is still unclear if 10-20% of women are within the country or the world. The authors also state in the introduction that no studies have examined prevalence of depression among this population, but then cite a study in this section regarding the prevalence rate. This inconsistency should be addressed.

- We have included a sample of the questionnaire as part of supplementary materials for the paper.

- The 10 -20% is from studies conducted in the world but no studies exist from the African continent. Page 7, line 3.
The study quoted was conducted in women who had a term delivery and not women who had experienced a miscarriage as in our study. Page 7, Line 5 & 6.

(3) Most concerns that had been identified with the discussion were addressed. The manuscript still lacks an explanation as to why this highly educated, socially supported sample has such high depression screen rates compared to rates reported in other studies. The authors made a good point about the socio-cultural issues, but this should be further explained or compared with other literature especially given the socio-demographics of this sample. Clinical implications were briefly discussed in the conclusion, but given the relevance of this study for clinical settings, these should be explained more thoroughly.

- We have analyzed the implications of the socio-demographic factors on the occurrence of depression after a miscarriage. However, this will be further explored in a subsequent manuscript that takes an in-depth look at these factors and how they influence depression after a miscarriage. The authors thought that combining the two themes into the same paper may have distorted the message of the papers and hence opted to have the initial manuscript focus more on the determination of prevalence and the follow up paper look at the analyses of the implication of the various socio-demographic factors. Page 14, Line 3 to 5.

- The authors have further explained the clinical implications and would explore the role of targeted screening in the next manuscript. Page 15, Line 12 to 18.