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Reviewer's report:

This study reports prevalence and factors associated with depression during pregnancy and the postpartum period in a large population-based sample of Israeli women. The study adds to the literature in this field and has a number of strengths, including the sample size and the use of a validated and universally recognised self-report measure for peripartum depression. The structure of the manuscript requires attention to ensure the rationale, methods and results are clear for the reader. Specifically, I have the following recommendations:

Background

The background provides an overview of the potential impact of peripartum depression on women and their families. It highlights some of the factors that have been associated with depression during pregnancy and the postpartum period. Consider presenting the background information on prevalence [page 3, lines 39-47] before the information on factors associated with depression.

The authors should present a stronger rationale for the study, i.e. what gaps there are in the literature and the need for this study.

Clarify the existing research which has focused specifically on Israeli women, or highlight that there is little research on this population.

There is information about the EPDS in the background which would be more appropriately placed in the methods section (page 3, lines 32-39).

Methods

The methods could be presented with more clarity. Consider structuring the methods with additional subheadings: for example, this could include: design, population/sample, measures, variables (identify outcome variable and predictor variables), analysis, etc.

The EPDS assesses mood/symptoms of depression. Consider rephrasing the following sentence: The EPDS comprises 10 questions that access information about the respondent's state of being [page 4, line 18].
A reference should be provided for using a score of >0 on item 10 of the EPDS to classify women as depressed, in addition to using an overall score of 10 or above, which indicates 'possible depression'.

'Blood test results' is one of the variable groups. Consider moving this paragraph below the paragraph describing the other variable groups [page 4, lines 46-57]. Are 'blood test results' medical factors? For example, could medical factors be further categorised as: 1) medical conditions 2) medication 3) blood markers?

Define 'living in the peripheral region of the country' for readers who are not familiar with the geography, and perhaps comment on differences between populations living in the periphery or otherwise.

The subsection titled 'The study protocol' describes the sample and would be better labelled as such.

Provide a clear overview of the descriptive, univariate and multivariate analyses which were conducted in the statistical analysis section.

What level of significance was required at univariate level for variables to be included in the multivariate analysis?

What method was used to enter the variables into the multivariate analysis?

What statistical programme was used to complete the analysis?

Results

The results would also be clearer if subheadings were used. Consider presenting: 1) descriptive analyses (including description of sample, prevalence and characteristics of depressed/non-depressed women) 2) regression analyses organised by variable categories: sociodemographic, medical, etc.

If available, data should be included to show the differences between women who did and did not complete the EPDS, women who did and did not attend the MHS clinics, and women who were and were not members of MHS. This would enable assessment of the representativeness of the women included in the study. If data are unavailable for any of these groups, some description should be included regarding any potential differences.

Report the proportion of women who scored 10 or more on the EPDS and the proportion of women who scored above 0 on item 10 of the EPDS. Were there differences between the women classified as depressed according to these different scoring protocols?

Provide details of the univariate analyses: it would be helpful to see both crude odds ratios and adjusted odds ratios for each of the variables.
Discussion

The authors state that they found lower rates of depression compared to other findings and then report the results of a review indicating a range, which includes the rate found in this study.

Tables

Structure the characteristics in Table 1 and the variables in Table 2 according to group: sociodemographic, medical, lifestyle, etc.

Indent the subcategories, as you have with age.

Consider breaking down 25-40 years age group as this covers a wide range of ages, including both relatively young and relatively old mothers.

The SD for age is presented in the percentage column for 'without peripartum depression'.

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

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal