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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary revisions:

1. Some reference citations require expansion to enable retrieval. Note # 10 (already published); 19 (needs publisher/state), 20 (lacks specific date); 26 & 27 (lack a date); 20 (lacks all journal information), 43 (already published) 46 (needs publisher/state); 47 (needs journal information); 48 (typo “best”) and lacks volume and page; 53 (needs publisher info or URL), 55 (uncertain what this is and could not retrieve from that URL)

Minor essential revisions:

1. Figure 1; y axis label should be rewritten; x axis titles should be written out. (Table legend is well-written).

2. Methods: study design, para 2: Please expand up the sampling strategy. From which source were these samples obtained? Is there perhaps some central registry that contains contact information for the population of provider groups that spans all provinces?

3. Results – para 2 – seems counterintuitive to all other data in this narrative that being female was NOT associated with favorable attitudes toward home birth among midwives. Please explain or defend this!

4. Results: paras 3,4,5 (scale scores by care provider group). This section in the first in which we see the actual population and sample sizes, and the respective response rates; although the reader has to perform the actual mathematical computation. Please provide the figures for all three groups (e.g., FP- 139 respondents out of a random sample of 3000, out of a population size of ???) at this point in the narrative. Authors do discuss the low response rate for FPs, but only at the end of the narrative – after having engaged in a full discussion as if the information was, in fact, generalizable….and it is not.

5. The content of Table 2 is very obscure. The content is discussed in Data analysis; para 2. Do the 18 content items in Table 2 represent ALL of the remainder of the attitude statements that were written and then tested (of which 17 were retained to comprise the PAPHB-M), or only some of them (given that Table 2 title states “with selected attitude items?” Authors should devote a bit more explanation/rationale for exploration of these “additional” attitude items,
which did NOT have sufficient robustness to be retained within the PAPHB-M – but are treated in Table 2 as if they do in fact, have some important meaning.

Major compulsory revisions
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