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Dear BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth Editorial Team,

Thanks for the comments, which have helped us improve the manuscript further. Below you will find the reviewer’s report with our answers in red. In the manuscript the corrections is written in bold text.

Yours sincerely,

Malin Söderberg
RN, RM, PhD
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**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Attitudes toward Fertility and Childbearing Scale (AFCS): An Assessment of a New Instrument for Women Not Yet Mothers in Sweden

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 14 July 2013  
**Reviewer:** Despina Sapountzi-Krepia

**Reviewer's report:**
An interesting paper to those with closely related research interests.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I am satisfied with the correction made to the manuscript. I suggest the publication of the paper

---

**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Attitudes toward Fertility and Childbearing Scale (AFCS): An Assessment of a New Instrument for Women Not Yet Mothers in Sweden

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 11 July 2013  
**Reviewer:** Kathrin Stoll

**Reviewer's report:**
Title: Attitudes toward Fertility and Childbearing Scale (AFCS): An Assessment of a New Instrument for Women Not Yet Mothers in Sweden

**Second review:** Kathrin Stoll

Thank you for your revisions. Please see below my comments:

Thanks for your comments which have helped to further improve our manuscript. Please see our answers below and changes in manuscript in bold.

Abstract:
What is a ‘developmental design’? I have not heard that term.  
*Please see corrections in the first line, methods section*

Be more specific about your comparative statistics. What did you compare? Please see line five in the methods section.

If you report how construct validity was assessed, please also report how reliability was assessed (i.e. by calculating Cronbach’s alpha). *Please see the results section*

In your discussion you state that construct validity was also assessed with the read aloud method. Please be very clear how each psychometric component was assessed to avoid confusion. *This has been corrected please see the second section of the discussion.*
I don’t think you need to include info on the Kaiser Meyer Olkin and Bartlett’s test in the abstract. It is better to report actual findings, such as the Cronbach’s alpha. Please see changes in the abstract results section. We have shortened the abstract background due to the word limit.

Keywords: Change explorative factor analysis to exploratory factor analysis. Corrected, this has also been done in the methods section.

Background section: This section has better flow, but still needs language editing. Thanks for adding info about the qualitative studies that informed instrument development. A few additional changes have been made to the text after consulting a third proof-reader. If you are still not satisfied with the language please let us know what is not satisfying.

Methods: Thank you for adding the requested content.

Results: Do you really need to report both the pattern and structure coefficients in Table 1? They seem very similar. Following Pallant (2012) both coefficients should be reported when using Oblimin rotation.

Discussion: The new section you added to the discussion does not fit there. Please move sections that explain your methods or state your results into the respective sections in your manuscript. The third section about Cronbach alpha has now been moved to the results section, see the first line in the second section. The section that starts: ”The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin...” in the second section of the discussion has been shortened and moved to the results section, it starts: ”The examination of Catell’s…”. The second section in the discussion has been rewritten.

Section that starts with: ‘The sample size of 138’…… and ends with ‘as this is the first analysis’. I know I criticized your sample size for factor analysis, and appreciate that you provide a rationale for the adequacy of your sample size in this section. However, I think the section needs to be rewritten or deleted. I think you have strengthened your case for the ‘factorability’ of your items, by adding more detail about the tests you ran. The section; ‘The sample size of 138’… and ends with ‘as this is the first analysis’ has been deleted

Perhaps a better approach might be to insert a small section at the end of the manuscript that proposes potential next steps, such as additional psychometric testing with a larger sample and formal translation of the instrument into English. Please see end of discussion.

Other comments: You adequately addressed my concerns about the social identity coefficients. Thank you and all the best with your paper.

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: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.