

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_128070
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and risk factors associated with postpartum depression during the covid-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant public health concern: postpartum depression (PPD) during the COVID-19 pandemic. It provides valuable insights into how the pandemic has amplified mental health challenges for postpartum women, particularly through factors like anxiety and fear of infection. The study's focus on a specific demographic in Teófilo Otoni, Brazil, adds regional relevance, and its findings could inform targeted interventions and public health policies. By highlighting associations between PPD and variables such as educational attainment and pandemic-induced stress, the study contributes to a growing body of literature on maternal mental health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, for greater precision and searchability, consider revising it to: "Prevalence and Risk Factors of Postpartum Depression During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence from a Cross-Sectional Study in Teófilo Otoni, Brazil."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well-structured but could be enhanced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including the specific prevalence ratio from the multivariate analysis (Adjusted PR for anxiety = 2.46) to underscore key findings. • Briefly mentioning limitations, such as the cross-sectional design, for balance. • Refining the conclusion to suggest practical implications for healthcare providers and policymakers. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound and employs appropriate statistical methods, including chi-square tests and Poisson regression. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify if all significant variables from the bivariate analysis were included in the multivariate model. • Provide additional detail on the handling of missing data in statistical analyses. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and mostly recent. However, you could include the following to enhance the manuscript's depth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A global perspective on PPD prevalence during the pandemic, such as Patel et al., 2021, in <i>Journal of Psychiatric Research</i>. • A study on maternal mental health interventions during pandemics, e.g., Chmielewska et al., 2021, in <i>The Lancet Global Health</i>. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical refinements and formatting of statistical results (e.g., p-values and CI formatting) could improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The discussion section effectively compares the findings with existing literature but would benefit from further exploration of the study's implications for public health practice. • The limitations section should explicitly address the self-reported nature of data, which might introduce bias. <p>No obvious signs of plagiarism were noted.</p> <p>The authors have declared no competing interests, and there is no indication of bias or conflict.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaila Fazal
Department, University & Country	Malir University of Science and Technology, Pakistan