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Reviewer's report:

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Effects of work related factors on breastfeeding behavior of working mothers
Yi Chun Chen

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
The question posed is an important one, but is not well defined. See specific comments below.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
The study is a cross sectional survey.
The sample was based on women identified on the Company records as having had maternity leave. In order to ensure that the sampling is accurate some information should be given on the completeness of these records.
Two dependent variables are used in the study: Commencing breastfeeding and breastfeeding after returning to work. However we are not told how long after return to work the babies have been breastfed. This might have been as short as one day. If the data is available it would be better to have a variable that represents breastfeeding for a longer period of time – say breastfeeding for two months after return to work.

A further analysis should be undertaken to see if time since pregnancy makes a difference. Some of the pregnancies were up to 4 years prior to interview, others would only be within a month of returning to work. Comparing the <1 year group with the >3 years group would show whether length of memory recall had influenced the results.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The conclusions are understated and could be stronger than they are. The study reveals a serious public health problem. Infants who are not breastfed are at risk of increased morbidity and mortality and this should be highlighted in the conclusions.
(World Health Organization Collaborative Study Team on the Role of Breastfeeding on the Prevention of Infant Mortality 2000)

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
7. Is the writing acceptable?
OK

8. Background
Include a reference to the fact that the WHO also recommends exclusive breastfeeding to six months of age. This is mentioned at the end of this section but no reference is given. Select from some of these references. (WHO 2001; WHO 2001; WHO 2002; WHO Department of Nutrition for Health and Development 2002; WHO 2005)

9. Reference #4 American Assoc Ped is incorrectly cited in the references. This reference is actually obsolete and should be updated to their more recent statement. (American Academy of Pediatrics 2005)

10. The objectives of the paper are contained in the following paragraph:

“In addition to assessing current worksite policies for breastfeeding, work-related factors that affect breastfeeding behaviors were also examined. The aim of this study was to provide guidance for increasing the availability of worksite breastfeeding and removing barriers to achievement of WHO recommendations.”

This needs to be re-written into specific objectives or research questions. Here are some possible ways the objectives might be re-written:
- Describe current worksite breastfeeding policies in Taiwan
- Document the breastfeeding practices of working mothers in Taiwan
- To identify the risk factors for not breastfeeding in Taiwan mothers

11. References

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No