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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. There is no research question posed by the author
2. There is no discussion on how the freehand responses in the questionnaire were analysed.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The study design and sample are described well, however, the data collection sections needs further explanation around development of the questionnaire and how reliability and validity were ensured. Also it was not clear how and when informed written consent was obtained prior to data collecting. The process for information giving and gaining informed consent has not been described in detail under the data collection section. It is also not clear how the questionnaires were coded so that a questionnaire can be retrieved if one of the participants decided to withdraw at a later date. Where the participants told that they could withdraw at any time? Ethics is mentioned but there is no detail who form/where ethical approval was obtained.
2. The results were mostly clearly set out in the text and in tables and graphs in the appendix although when referring to the tables/figures please include the appropriate appendix in brackets. It not clear what percentage of the midwives completed the questionnaires.
3. Other comments on the manuscript are below:

Abstract
UK needs to be written out in full when first presented
‘midwifery’ team not ‘Midwifery’ team

Background
Page 3
Second paragraph – Should read National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence followed by (NICE).
Netmums should be referenced

Page 4
1st paragraph
The reference for the following statement ‘Evidence suggest that health-related behaviour change based… [23]’ is from NICE guidelines, when one would expect the inclusion of other research evidence.

‘Midwives should be ‘midwives’

3rd paragraph
‘women’ not ‘mothers’

Page 5
First paragraph
First sentence needs a reference

Methods

Page 5
Second paragraph
The Health Board has been mentioned several times in the article. Please check if this acceptable or should it be anonymised to protect the anonymity of the participants?

3rd Paragraph
Number placed at the beginning of a sentence should be in text format

Page 6
1st paragraph
The list of bullet points need an introduction

Data collection
See comments above

Last paragraph
The likert scale needs a reference

Data analysis
Page 7
What is the Clopper-Pearson exact method and why was it chosen? I have not assessed the statistics here as I am not an expert in this field.

Ethics needs to be under a separate heading and not incorporated with the analysis
Results – see comments above.
See comments re naming the health board

Discussion
Page 9
2nd paragraph
Re supplementary questions: was this freehand or Yes/No answers?
Figures and tables need to refer to appropriate appendix

Page 11
2nd paragraph
‘Midwives should be ‘midwives’

Strengths and limitations
Page 12
The sentence on experts in the field of motivational interviewing needs to be referenced
3 lines up from the bottom:
‘small sample…had to be combined to enable statistical analysis…’ – this was not made clear in the analysis section

Conclusion
Last sentence in this section:
Did you mean incorporate into the core curricular for student midwives?

Questionnaires
Both questionnaires are clearly set out

**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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