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**Reviewer's report:**

General comments:
The purpose of the study and paper are much clearer now. In particular, the revised methods and results sections flow better and link the subject matter more clearly. Thankyou for the revisions and showcasing the positive impact of this program.

Major compulsory revisions:
1. The concept of 'usual care' is still not clear for the reader. I assume this means the absence of peer-support services?, but assume that other breastfeeding support and promotion activities are present. Similarly it is not clear if the terms 'targeted support', 'lay support', 'extra support' used throughout the paper are interchangeable with the term 'peer support'. This confusion may be easily and readily avoided if definitions were provided, or consistent terms used.

2. Context section: 'MSW' please introduce this term.

Minor Essential revisions:
3. Please check grammar and wording in some sections of the discussion. Eg; Page 19 paragraph 3: 'our findings are also confirmed in the descriptions given of the qualities needed....'.

4. Conclusion. Do you have any recommendations? Does the program continue?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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