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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, a most interesting and useful literature review, which will provide a valuable of source information for future research in this field.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, for an integrative literature with systematic search strategy

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes; clear strategy, well described. Suitable for the form of diverse literature involved.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes; different forms of article/papers are identified

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, for a literature review; all papers clearly identified and appropriately referenced for retrieval

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes. A few minor adjustments are needed, listed below.
Page 2 (and elsewhere)
Conclusions: refers to ‘all the more’ parents. The term ‘the majority of’ would be usual.

Page 4 (end)
‘. . . peer-reviewed articles in English in CSA.’ What is CSA??

Page 13 (near end)
‘The average age of these parental internet users is 35. For example in Madge & O’Connor’s [16] web-based survey on the British parenting website ‘Babyworld’, 76% of the visitors was under 35 years old.’

This doesn’t make sense; should it be ‘The average age of these parental internet users is UNDER 35.’ ??

Page 15 (near end)
‘Similarly to Dunham’s study, they found that factors such as living without a partner and having lower educational and income levels were factors that increased perceived support for the parents (mothers).’

This doesn’t make sense; should it be ‘were factors that increased perceived NEED FOR support for. . .’ ???

Page 17 (top)
‘In most cases this center on the need for complimentary information, a second opinion, to compliment the information already provided by their doctor or to confirm what they are already thinking [6].’

This should be “In most cases this centers on the need for complementary information, a second opinion, to complement the information already provided by their doctor or to confirm what they are already thinking [6].”

(middle paragraph)
‘It was found that women both discussed and sort support on a variety of day-to-day issues. . . .’

This should be ‘It was found that women both discussed and sought support on a variety of day-to-day issues. . . .’

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: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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