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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

1) Throughout the manuscript the authors have to be consistent with their use of “depressive symptoms” (which they can and are exploring) versus “depression” (which they cannot and are not measuring). Do a double check of the entire paper to make sure a diagnosis of depression is not being given.

2) I would caution the authors about writing that they “ensure a representative sample” in Methods, first paragraph. They have a selection of women from different health service sites, and do not offer a comparison against characteristics of all other women NOT in their study to say they represent everyone else with their sample. Look for this throughout the manuscript.

3) Methods, first paragraph – the authors name the hospital, health centre and dispensary to be sites in their study. But no explanation is given as to why THOSE locations, over the other choices. For example, out of 12 dispensaries, why was Buhongwa selected? Such information is extremely valuable in terms of your results and interpretation of those results.

4) Similarly the next sentence provides details of the numbers of women seeking antenatal care at the health service sites. But is this low or high compared to those sites not selected for the study. A brief comparison should be given to help put your study into context.

5) Also, the “study period” mentioned by the authors in Methods – was there anything about that period worth noting? A special time of year, any particular ceremonies or celebrations occurring, perhaps climate change means those months are particularly hard. For readers who are not familiar with Africa and the location of study, perhaps a very brief mention of whether or not those months held any particular meaning. If not, simply state that.

6) The authors should mention if the women were interviewed in private? That is... in a separate room, and also without members of family or husband present. This is important information for the results.

7) Methods, paragraph nine – if the authors maintained items in their statistical models which were based on social/cultural significance, as opposed to statistical
significance, perhaps a reference could be included which supports this.

8) Results, first paragraph – the reader does not know how many women were approached and did not participate. We are told that 397 pregnant women took part – out of how many? Did every woman consent/agree? Then state this.

9) Discussion, paragraph one – again, authors perhaps should not use “representative sample” – instead refer to the diversity?

10) Discussion, final paragraph – before the study limitation and strengths, I would recommend a reflective paragraph which appraises the methodology. It is important for studies such as this one to receive publication consideration, as it does detail experiences of women who do not hold high SES status, or perhaps have a multitude of health services available to them – and I would like to see the authors reflect upon their own work, and the suitability of their methods (or improvements for next time), how this could have impacted on their results and what this means. Culturally situated research such as this would benefit from a moment of reflection on what was done, and implications for future work. I believe a couple of paragraphs along such lines would really add to the overall manuscript.

11) A thorough proofing for expression and correct grammar.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

1) Title of manuscript – seems a little lengthy for the reader. Perhaps the authors would consider a more succinct title?

2) Background, second paragraph – text reads “…that is the 10/90 gap…” perhaps the authors might qualify this very briefly in brackets afterwards … for example…. (whereby less than 10% of the worldwide expenditure on health research…etc )

3) Background, final sentence on the page currently – use of “countries” two times in the same sentence… “…between countries in low- and middle-income countries”…. Remove “countries in”.

4) Background, second page, last sentence before Methods heading – the authors say they will determine the proportion of depressive symptoms among pregnant women in Mwanza city… etc. Naturally the authors are looking at proportions and risk factors in a “selection” of women… not all women.

5) Question – were staff at the health service sites trained by researchers to approach women to participate in the study? In Methods, paragraph three – the text reads that “the research team was provided two days of orientation”…. Shouldn’t the research team already know what they are doing? Do you mean the onsite health staff were provided with training in study protocols by the research team? It’s not coming out clearly enough at present in the text.

6) Question – what happened when a woman attended the different health service sites – could she have been recruited at any of them? What happened
when a woman was recruited once and then visited another site and might have been recruited a second time? No mention is made of this possibility.

7) Methods, paragraph six – the text reads “women were asked to respond to three questions closed-ended questions”…. Remove the first “questions” where it appears.

8) Methods, paragraph seven – final sentence says data were checked to ensure there were no errors. So, what happened if there were errors? What types of errors are the authors referring to? Could a woman be re-interviewed? How did researchers reconcile errors if they did occur?

9) Results, first paragraph, Start of 5th sentence – spell out long hand “195”. Do not begin a sentence with a number.

10) Discussion, paragraph four – the authors refer to a qualitative study. This does need a reference. They are presenting some of the results in the Discussion, so a reference is required.

11) Discussion, paragraph five – the authors did not ask the women if they worked during their interview? So, although interesting, it’s not elaborating on results from the research.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

1) Background, first paragraph – text reads “…and its association with underutilization of antenatal care services, negative experiences of childbirth…” perhaps the authors would consider re-ordering the five things in that sentence in an order more indicative of pregnancy and birth? Underutilization of antenatal care services, then complications during pregnancy, then negative experience of childbirth, then adverse pregnancy outcomes and then infant mortality.

2) Question – Background, second paragraph – text reads “… a systematic review of 21 studies on antenatal depression….” As the next sentence refers to studies in low and middle income countries, the authors might consider stating if the 21 studies were all high income.

3) The use of “peri-urban” could benefit from a very brief description for readers who are used to different expressions.

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.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.