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Reviewer's report:

This study aimed to assess the prevalence of CMD and its determinants among pregnant women in Southeast Ethiopia. The authors tried to add new knowledge in the related field. However, I found major issues in the study design and reporting in the manuscript. I have indicated issues and provided suggestions intending to help to improve the manuscript in the following sections.

I found that the manuscript missed the rational (knowledge gap) for the current study. Why this study was needed? The manuscript cited five studies conducted in Ethiopia for the similar purpose already (line 105-106). Then what can we expect from this study to contribute to the knowledge? The authors should provide a strong rationale for a need for the current study in the Introduction section before the aim of the study.

It seems to me that the authors are confused with 'CMD', 'mental disorder', 'anxiety, depression' etc. For instance, the authors reported the adverse impact of 'mental disorder' in one sentence (line 82-85) and the other sentence reports an impact of 'anxiety and depression' (line 85-88). This is a major issue. I would suggest authors go through the recent manual of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental disorders (DSM) and WHO classification of Mental Disorders. They may also be interested in referring the book 'Common mental disorder, a bio-social model' of Goldberg and Huxley (Goldberg and Huxley 1992). Then they may use the suitable term of 'CMD' or 'mental disorder' or 'anxiety, depression' as they wish to measure in their study and make it consistent throughout the manuscript.

The manuscript has significant problems on the flow of information, connecting ideas each-other, redundancy of information etc. I would like to suggest consulting English language expert to fix English and improve the flow of information efficiently.

Specific comments and suggestions are as follows:

Abstract

Date of data collection should include in the abstract.

In line 35, 'validated' questionnaire where? The authors reported in Method that they adapted tools and pretested for the study but not validated in the local context. Therefore, 'standardised' would be a better term than 'validated'.
In line 36, WHO should place before 'Self-Reported Questionnaire' and should keep SRQ in the bracket to make it clear that this is referring to the research tool. Otherwise, it may lead to misinterpretation as a general term of 'self-reported questionnaire' but not the tool.

SRQ is designed to 'screen' CMDs but not 'diagnose' it. Therefore, 'diagnose' must replace with 'screen' in line 36 and other respective sections.

In line 43-45 in the abstract, I do not think the recommendation to train health worker comes from the research. This study did not explore if they need training on screening antenatal CMDs and its determinants. We, as researchers are not allowed to recommend something beyond our research findings. Therefore, I would suggest removing this sentence.

Plain English summary

Authors provided long background information, but they did not provide aim (purpose) and methods of the study. Therefore, I would suggest limiting background information in one sentence and include the aim and methods of the study in the plain language.

Background

Background of the manuscript is poorly structured. Information is repeated in different places. I would suggest the authors restructure it. I have some suggestions that the authors may consider improving it. If authors understand the concept of 'mental disorder', 'CMD'..., this would also help restructure the manuscript.

In line 68-69, the sentence "On the other hand, mental health problems like anxiety and depression are very common during pregnancy and postnatal period worldwide." is repeating the concept of previous sentences. Why do authors think to use 'on the other hand' in the sentence? I would suggest removing this sentence.

Sentence two (line 64-66) and sentence seven (line 72-75) in the background are providing similar information. Authors may merge these together.

The authors introduced a new concept of the adverse impact of antenatal CMDs (line 69-72) in the paragraph they discussed prevalence. The sentence may fit in the second paragraph where they repeated about the adverse impact of antenatal CMDs.

The authors repeated adverse impact of antenatal CMDs again in line 78-81 in the first paragraph and third paragraph (line 89-90). They repeated prevalence in the third paragraph (line 92-94). They must avoid repetition of information.

They discussed factors (determinants) of antenatal CMDs in various location (line 66, 75-76, 78-81). They may wish to discuss determinants in a separate paragraph.
The authors suddenly introduced the prevalence of CMDs in high-income countries (line 76-78) in between the paragraph where they were discussing something else. If they wish to discuss this, the best place maybe after the first sentence of the background.

In line 80, what ANC CMD is referring too? It should specify clearly.

The authors refer to depression, anxiety disorders, eating disorders and psychosis are "the antenatal disorders" in a sentence in line 85-88. These are mental disorders but not antenatal disorders! They may wish to write 'antenatal mental disorders'?

Materials and method

Authors reported that the study is a community-based study. How is it since they used antenatal check-up registration book to identify sample? The study did not report what is the antenatal check-ups coverage in these areas? From where they recruited and interviewed pregnant women? In antenatal clinics of hospitals or health centres or at their home? If they recruited from antenatal clinics, then how can they claim that the study was community-based? I would suggest explaining and clarify this in the Method.

Why did the authors choose Robe, Goba and Ginnir of Bale zone as study area? What is the difference or similarity of this area? What is the significance to include three areas? For instance, to make representativeness? Authors must describe this.

In line 101, the data 67, 124, 48, 435 is confusing for one or two administrative areas. They can use a semicolon or use the name of an administrative area for each data to avoid confusion.

They reported that they used 'single population proportion formula' to calculate sample size. They did not provide information on how they reached a sample size of 748. This should explain.

The authors did not report about the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study. In which trimester of pregnancy, they planned to recruit and interview pregnant women? This information should report in the Method.

In data collection tools and procedure, authors need to describe each study tool including items of the tools, psychometric properties, whether the tools are locally validated or not etc.

Authors did not report what and how socio-demographic and reproductive factors measured.

Authors need to describe what is the basis they selected variables to include in their study?

There is no information at all about the data collection procedure. A description of the data collection procedure should be provided including how the researchers approached the study participants, where and how they interviewed etc. Authors mentioned that they used antenatal check-up registration book to obtain a list of pregnant women. Where did they find pregnant women and where they interviewed at the clinics, at home?
Reference citation for Epi Info and SPSS should be included (line 138-139).

In line 141-142, authors described that "All variables significantly related to CMD caseness at a p \textless 0.2 level were then examined in bivariate logistic regression analysis." How did the authors determine the p-value of \textless 0.2 for variables? This should be reported.

Results

Why authors grouped 'unemployed', 'private employee', 'farmers' together in 'others' category of 'job of respondents'? These may have a different impact on antenatal CMDs and may bring different results of data analysis.

I would suggest the authors report the confidence interval of the prevalence of antenatal CMDs.

'On how many people do you rely' for what, in Table 3?

In the statement - 'How easy to get practical help from our neighbours', the authors may refer to participants' neighbour. This must be clarified.

Discussion

Authors largely stated their findings with referencing previous studies in the Discussion. However, I would suggest that authors discuss their findings rather than repeating results. For instances, what and why particular results have public health significance? Why study brought particular results?

In line 209, authors may intend to put a comma between 35.8% and which….but not full stop.

In the first paragraph of the Discussion, the authors must explain what methodological differences may lead to the different findings of the prevalence of CMDs. This would help readers to understand the reason for differences clearly. Just stating 'methodological difference…' is not enough for readers to understand the difference.

In paragraph two, line 220-226, explanation for different findings of education as a determinant of antenatal CMDs is incomplete and inaccurate. Cultural context alone may not determine, but this could be a result of complex interaction of local context, the personal circumstance of women, for instance, relationship quality with an intimate partner, empowerment at home and society. This should explain.

The limitation of the study is incomplete in the Discussion. The study used a standardised screening tool to measure CMDs but not locally validated. This should describe as a major limitation of the study.
The strength of the study is missing in the Discussion. This should report. For instance, if authors provide strong knowledge gap and they think they addressed it, they can include this as a strength of the study. If they think this is a community-based study and they describe how this study is community-based as I raised the question above, they can include this as another strength of the study.

Conclusions

As I mentioned above, the statement "The Bale Zone health office in collaboration with key stakeholders should integrate CMD screening tools with current antenatal care guidelines, provide mental health training for obstetric care providers, including how to use CMD screening tools and refer patients to available mental health services. Moreover, the women should be educated about the prevention and treatment of CMD." are not coming from results of the study. Therefore, I would suggest removing this. Alternatively, the authors may be interested in modifying the recommendation.
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