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Reviewer’s report:

Overall - a nice paper but quite technical in its statistical language – which is necessary and appropriate BUT could do with a little gentle support for the non stats-minded reader to appreciate what is going on. Particularly the principle that high correlation indicates good reliability but simultaneously can suggest redundancy of items – not sure that that comes across clearly.

(I may have a confused grasp of the principles myself ! but either way, the average reader may have the same difficulty)

I have therefore designated these as major rather than minor changes but I expect the authors can probably be trusted to address them

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

P1L2 can result in emergency
P1L5 outcomes either for the women or their children
P1L15 Focused on fears and anxiety as risk factors
P3 Bandura’s
P5 Line 1 as modelled in ??? [35]
P5 L15 Rather than simple linguistic
P6L5 And then discussed it – together??
P6L6 submitted to the authors --- and then what??
P7L2 Routine antenatal visit
P8L1 In the first instrument translation phase, 4th step,
P8L4 In the second psychometric testing phase,
P8L18 furthermore (I think better)
P10LL11 Overall, in phase one translation, most …
P11L1 reluctant to answer – but did they?
And perhaps insert: reluctant to answer ‘questions about the suitability of’ the CBSEI
P11L11 Had not hade
P11L12 – scarcely filled out – SO? what action, if any, did you take on this?
P11 second last line – significant difference (Z score ??) between
Or P12 L1 Wilcoxon test of difference Z score
P13 L5 furthermore

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
P11LL8-9 majority – 44.9% ???

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
P12 first paragraph – I think for the general reader these figures need a little simultaneous explanation in plain language – perhaps for example: that mothers expectation and confidence were (perhaps understandably) less for Second stage than active labour
And later: about Spearman’s – what does this mean in plain language?
And later again under construct validity – explain how three factors are identified AND how interpreted as self control, and distraction (this seems clear enough BUT how do you justify positive affirmation nd what do negative numbers in F3 indicate is anything?)
And, in brief, explain eigen factors
P13L6 Lowest inter item correlations or lowest correlations with other items … and so?...explain
P14L13 and P15L4 - these two comments may be correct But they seem to contradict the last line in P13 or at least this apparent disparity could do with comment
P14L15 – not a trait – Ok but perhaps explain clarify a little the significance of concept ‘trait’ compared to ?? – trait stability and its alternatives - context specific / amenability to change
P15L11 –loadings – no explanation given
P15L18 – confirmatory FA? some explanation or reference here
P15 Last lines – how she can and how midwifes and health care can (I think)

Conclusion
P16L8 the PCA (in full) findings
A three factor solution – to what? – short explanatory here (or earlier) would help
In effect are you suggesting a 30 item CBSEI? how might that be further validated?
PCA, KMO and Bartlett’s sphericity – could be further explained in text or as glossary rather than just abbreviations
The following are perhaps more debates to be had AFTER publication but occur to me now

P9 L9 – regarding change to instructions - ‘when pushing out baby’ is more specific that in second stage than your version – so your rephrasing is, I feel, a significant (and possibly detrimental) conceptual change

P9L13 and 16 But ‘pain’ has definite negative connotations and maybe therefore another change that might threaten translation validity

P9L21 and 23 while each option for item 9 is quite vague original ‘stay on top’ is positive but ‘follow rhythm’ is arguably more reactive/ submissive and these changes may again be expected to relate conceptually to expectation and self-efficacy ratings
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