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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written and interesting manuscript reporting on mental health and parenting outcomes of mothers following their admission at a mother-baby unit. However, I have a few substantive concerns:

1. It is not at all obvious what the knowledge gap is, and therefore what this study adds to what is already known in this area. It is not sufficient to state that this is "the first study to use latent class modelling to examine the trajectories of clinical and parenting outcomes." I think the readers would like to know what these techniques can add to what is already known.

2. It's not clear why the authors are reporting trajectories for each clinical and parenting outcome separately, rather than profiling overall trajectories by including all of these outcomes in a single latent class analysis. For clinicians, overall trajectories would be more useful as many of the conditions tend to co-occur. If there is a reason for conducting separate analysis by outcome, please justify this in the manuscript.

3. Please provide statistical significance values and/or effect sizes for all increases / decreases, in text or tables.

4. Are the results in the abstract an accurate representation? They begin with "The majority of women (93.3%) followed trajectories that were characterised by deterioration in self-reported mother-infant attachment following discharge" which reflects badly on MBUs whereas there are also lots of positive results reported in the manuscript.

Some minor corrections, suggestions and comments are provided in comments in the attached PDF.

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