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Dear Editor,

We hereby kindly ask you to reconsider this revised manuscript, entitled “Psychometric properties of the Swedish Childbirth Self-Efficacy Inventory (Swe-CBSEI)”, for publication. We deeply appreciate the encouraging and most valuable comments and suggestions made by the reviewers in order to improve this manuscript. All the comments have been carefully considered. We have performed a thorough revision in accordance to the comments and clarified many inconsistencies. Below follows a documentation of the responses to each point commented by the reviewers.

Sincerely Yours
Ing-Marie Carlsson

MS: 3783439401065786
Research article
Psychometric properties of the Swedish Childbirth Self-Efficacy Inventory (Swe-CBSEI)
Ing-Marie Carlsson, Kristina Ziegert and Eva Nissen
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Answer to editor: Firstly, we have once again sought assistance from a professional editing service to correct the language in the manuscript.

Answers to reviewer Wan-Yim IP

Dear reviewer

Thank you for taking your time reading and refining our manuscript. Your review has contributed to a number of improvements.

Method

Reviewer comment: Had a methodological design? Specify the design you have adopted.

Answer: We have removed this unclear sentence.

Result

Reviewer comment: How did researcher apply scree rules in your determination on how many components to retain?

Answer: We have used the scree test and visually determined the retained items according to this. To make this clearer we have included the following sentences in the text.

In the data analysis section:” In the analysis of the PCA, we used the following criteria for selecting the components that should be retained. These were: the Kaiser-Guttman criterion with components/with/ an eigenvalue >1, and a visual inspection of Catell’s scree test, looking for the break point where the curve flattens out. Moreover, only components with loadings exceeding >0.40 were retained [36].
And in the findings section: “All components with an eigenvalue more than >1 showing consistency with the visual Catell’s scree test were selected to be retained as components”

Discussion

Reviewer comment: What is a salutogenic approach?

Answer: The salutogenic approach focuses on resources for health, what’s enabling people to develop health through their strengths and health-promoting processes.

Reviewer comment: Table 1 is problematic: please tidy up the presentation, give notes to explain why the sum was not 100 for some items? By the way, why not putting this part finding in your discussion.

Answer: We have considered your suggestion and think that this is an excellent proposal. The table is now deleted, and these results are included in the text under the description of participants.

Reviewer comment: Please add your discussion on item 13, “Think about others in my family” in view of the participant’s comments and after your construct validity test. Add discussion part on construct validity findings e.g your final proposed construct of the scale, how many items in each dimension and short explanatory of each, how might that be further evaluated?

Answer: We have written in the discussion section that we suggest that the inventory should be reduced when it comes to the number of items and shortened to only address the labour process without differentiating between the stages. Three items is questioned whether they are relevant or not. If these are excluded the Swe-CBSEI will include 24 items (12 items in Outcome-active labour and 12 in efficacy-active labour).

We have also written that we propose that future work is needed to investigate and scrutinize these questions and further research can be done with a confirmatory factor analysis.