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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
page 2 line: They stated that "risk factors for AD...". There are several studies in LIC or LMIC.

page 2 line 18: the sentence started with the number 33.8%. Is it Ok according the journal rules?

page 3 line 1: there is a word missing after OR ("have an OR for antenatal depression")

page 3 line 4: Is this first sentence right (depression evident) ?

Background
page 4 line 10: the association between perinatal depression and adverse obstetrical outcome is controversial (see for example Faisal-Cury et al, Common mental disorders during pregnancy and adverse obstetric outcomes. J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol. 2010,31(4):229-35). There are evidence that negative impact of AD varies according to socioeconomic status from pregnant women more than the depression itself. This controversy should be mentioned in one sentence.

page 5 line 7: they used the words systematic revie twice to refered to the same article (see page 4 line 23)

page 6 line 14: pelase check the construction of the sentence

page 6 line 17: is the word realize right?. Or should it be accomplished (reach)

page 6 line 18: I would use the word prevalence instead of proportion

page 6 line 18 and 2: the authors should use ither depressive symptoms or antenatal depression, nut not boyh at the same time.

page 6 line 2. The senetnce could be "we aimed to estimate the prevalence of antenatal depression and its associated factors among ....". It is shorter and clearer.

Methods
page 7 line 14: it is surprising that all pregnant women agreed to participate.
page 7 line 18: urgent health care needs and obstetrical emergencies are not well defined. How many were eligible?. This is more important for external validity than internal validity. Nevertheless it should be defined in this part of the text.

page 8 line 8 and 9: i dont think the last part of the sentence makes any sense "there are no context of physical or emotional transition in high income countries?". What transitions are the authors talking about ?")

page 8 line 13-16. This part of the text shoud be either eliminate, reduced to (womne's with infection status were not eligible) or replaced in the text (it could be placed in one previous paragraph)

page 9 line 15: the word question appeared twice

page 10 line 12. the authors should explained why they collapsed the socio-economic variable.

page 10 line 19: considering that the prevalence of the outcome is so high (33.8%) it was better to use Poisson estimates instead of multiple logistic regression.

Results

page 12 line 13: it is so surprising that 15.4% of participants had a history of losing a child. Is this true?

page 12 line 18: as suggested previoulu I would use prevalence inesad of Proportion

page 13 line : natures of prvious delivery should be (better defined in the methodology section

Discussion

page 16 line 5: I dont see any particular reason to categorize marital status in "married, cohabiting and others". Are really diferent being married and cohabiting?. If the authors agree withs this statement the analysis should be reviewed.

page 16 line 12: the reference is missing


Tables

Table 1: It is much interesting including the Prevalence Ratios for each exposure variables than presenting two columns.

Tabel 2: there is a mistake in this table. See the line "pregnancy decision"
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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