PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Psychiatry*

Manuscript NO: 72061

Title: Peripartum depression and its predictors: A longitudinal observational hospital-based study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04583289

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: Egypt

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-18 01:56

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-18 14:36

Review time: 12 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [Y] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [Y] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Suggest to Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract e.g. Peripartum depression and its predictors in a hospital: Cross- sectional   study   2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?

under result: Suggest to rewrite Out of 968, 20.66% (n=200) of them had clinically significant symptoms of depression….   Result part: very difficult to read and suggest to rewrite.   3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? (all the key words needs to be double checked with MESH under Pubmed as they were not MESH term.   4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present

Suggest to give different prevalence for antepartum and post-partum separately Core tip needs to be rewrite as difficult to grasp it.   5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The design of study was wrong, the inclusion criteria were not appropriate Where is operational definition   6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field?   I am not sure the result was correct or not as the score for depression was continuous and no futher explanation how categorization was done. Furthermore why correlation test was done between   BDI-II scoring in the antepartum   period and socioeconomic states (r = -0.224, P = 0.001) as socioeconomic status is a categorical data as shown in Table 1. Furthermore I am not sure Table 3 is univartiate analysis for antepartum depression or post-partum depression.

Thus I didn't proceed with discussion as the univartate analysis was not conducted

appropriately.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Original theme.   Good biostatistical analysis.   Clear conclusion.   A reflection on the bipolar nature of these depression would have enriched the discussion.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the topic has already been addressed in other studies, this article contributes to improve knowledge in this area, taking into account the prevalence of the disease, which is not always recognised and valued. Although the results corroborate the data found in the literature on the prevalence and severity of depressive symptoms, as regards the predictors, anxiety was the only variable found. The article is well written and the results are correctly summarised. The tools seem appropriate and the sample size is quite interesting. The importance of this study lies in the need to raise awareness among patients and their families about psychiatric disorders, particularly depression, and to alert doctors to the prevalence and severity of depressive symptoms, enabling them to address depression with a view to avoiding/minimising the consequences on the health of both mother and child.