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Reviewer's report:

Introduction: The authors did not provide sufficient rationale why they need to study in female subjects who were the "elective" caesarean cases. The literatures that they had reviewed only demonstrated the relationship of antenatal depression with poor obstetrics outcome, which finally leads to caesarean section. Thus, the elective caesarean case in this study might not be explained by the effects of antenatal depression.

Methods: What is ASA I □II ? The authors should provide the full name before abbreviations. Either "DSM-5" or "DSM-V" should be consistently use along the manuscript.

Discussion: The potential mechanisms for this biomarker that related to AD should be more extensively review and the authors should mention about the usefulness of this biomarker as a predictor of antenatal depression when compare to a standard screening method (e.g. EPDS). Since the gestational age in both groups were about 38 weeks (very near term), the usefulness of this biomarker profile might not be as a predictor for AD or for management plan in pregnant women. It is will be more valuable and very helpful if the authors could demonstrate that the biomarker could predict postpartum blues/ postpartum depression. Potential treatment in the future based on the recent findings should be discussed.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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