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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

Second review: Kathrin Stoll

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

Abstract:
What is a ‘developmental design’? I have not heard that term.
Be more specific about your comparative statistics. What did you compare?
If you report how construct validity was assessed, please also report how reliability was assessed (i.e. by calculating Cronbach’s alpha).
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.

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.

Keywords: Change explorative factor analysis to exploratory factor analysis.

Background section: This section has better flow, but still needs language editing. Thanks for adding info about the qualitative studies that informed instrument development.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.