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Reviewer's report:

This is a unique manuscript, in that it addresses the issue of parental equality and how that is associated with infant feeding. The manuscript needs to provide additional details on the reliability of the BKAC, which was developed by the authors for this study.

Major compulsory revisions

1. Please provide information on the BKAC's Cronbach's alpha. Without this information, it is difficult to assess the reliability of the BKAC.

Minor essential revisions

1. Page 1, Results (The respondents, who were primiparae...) This sentence does not indicate the comparison groups.

2. Page 2, last sentence of conclusions The phrase, "focused on the groups indicated" is too vague, please clarify.

3. Page 2, reference 11 The mention of a 1976 study (34 years old) is too outdated for the literature review.

4. Page 2, second to last line and throughout text Recommend that you avoid colloquial phrases such as "nowadays".

5. Page 3, line 1, "rather than mothers" There are many studies of mothers attitudes. This sentence does not seem true.

6. Page 4, (The breastfeeding rates decrease rapidly and 60%...) Please double check the Labbok reference, as it does not include small amounts of water in the definition of exclusively breastfed infants.

7. Page 6, "Mothers confidence about, for example,..." This sentence is confusing, as it does not seem related to this paper. It may be clearer if you delete this sentence.

8. Page 8, second line from the bottom Does "breastfeeding scores" reflect the breastfeeding attitude score? Please
clarify.

9. Page 8, last line and throughout the manuscript
Recommend that you use a more neutral term than "mediocre".

10. Page 10
Much of this information is already stated in Table 4. Recommend deleting this text to avoid duplication.

11. Page 12, line 5
Delete "is not".

12. Page 12, line 6
Public breastfeeding is protected by law in several US states, not just in Arkansas.

13. Page 13, (The reliability of the BKAC is considered as fairly good...) This sentence does not provide information on the overall Cronbach's alpha. What do you mean by "for the first measure"?

14. General question
How is the reliability of the scenarios tested in your scale?

15. Page 15, Conclusion 2
The term, "apprehensive" seems overly strong. I don't think you measured apprehension.

16. Page 15, Conclusion 3
It seems odd to be publishing data based on the scale if you are not certain of its reliability. Please clarify.

17. Table 3
It would be interesting to see the data by gender.

18. Figure 1 does not seem necessary. Recommend deleting it.
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