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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks you for the opportunity to review this interesting paper. There are a couple of areas that would benefit from attention

Major compulsory revisions
The background sets the context well but requires attention to
pg 5 A further amendment would read better a 'A further extension...'
pg 6 There are several individual sentences in the middle of this page. These need integrating into a compete paragraph or into other paragraphs as they do not read well in the current format
Pg 8 you refer to 5 instruments of data collection. 3 of these appear to be designed for the study to collect information. However you claim all instruments are established? Is this true if they were designed for the study. I assume here you are perhaps referring to other psychometrically established instruments but you need to define this clearly. You also need to comment on the previous use related to a maternity care context and reliability and validity in this population. This is clearly critical when you are making assumptions based on outcome data from these measures

You seem to think the theory of Dick-Read is important - yet you only make a glancing reference to this work in the introduction and then briefly in the conclusion. I think you need to give this more prominence and explain it more lucidly
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