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General
This paper is a description of a survey conducted in Taiwan in 2003; participants were women with young children who were either factory or office workers. The study explored breastfeeding initiation and continuation using a range of variables.

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

Abstract
Methods: Add when the study was conducted.
Results: The proportion of women breastfeeding initially and on return to work should be reported. The average maternity leave of these employees should also be reported.

Background
P3. Para 1. As well as “inconvenient workplace conditions”, the early return to work is an important barrier to breastfeeding. This is brought up in the next paragraph, but I think it needs to be briefly mentioned in the first paragraph as well.

P3. 2nd para. AAP recommendation – the WHO recommendation would be better than an American authority.

P. 2nd para: “this recommendation” – this is not clear. Are the authors referring to a recommendation of a certain period of paid maternity leave?

P3. Para 3. “Pumping room” – is there a better word? “mother’s room”? “lactation room”?

P3. para 4. “worksite policies” – are these discussed in this paper?

P3. para 4. The aim of the study is stated to “provide guidance for increasing the availability of worksite breastfeeding and removing barriers …” This is obviously the longer term goal of the study, but it should be restated what this actual study aimed to do in terms of surveying recent mothers in the workplace to explore the correlates of maintaining breastfeeding while working (or something similar).

P4. Methods
Research setting and subjects. Is it possible to give the name of the city? I would also like to know how common it is for companies like this to provide “pumping rooms” and breaks.

P 4. 2nd para. These factory workers are working 12 hour shifts! I think the authors should state this explicitly and not rely on the reader calculating the lengths of shifts themselves.
P5. Para 1. “ethics committees” – were there more than one?

P5. Para 1. Questionnaires: were they anonymous? How were they collected? The number and response fraction should be reported in the results section.

P6. Results
The results section should start with some background data, eg the mean age of the women and level of education. Did the authors collect other information, such as number of children? What was the mean length of maternity leave?

P7. 2nd para. It would be clearer to start the sentence with “after returning to work” to clarify that the first para was about initiation and this para is about breastfeeding continuation. The results about maternal age are confusing – younger women were more likely to breastfeed, but less likely to continue to breastfeed (although the number of women continuing to breastfeed is fairly small). Can the authors explain this? Have they looked at different age groupings or parity?

P7. Multivariate logistic regression. With the adjusted ORs, please give 95% CIs as well. And in the last para on p7, use CIs rather than p values.

P8. Discussion
Breastfeeding has become two words occasionally. Please do a word check to ensure that breastfeeding is spelt as one word.

We have been told that about one third of women in this study did not breastfeed at all. We also need to know the rates of breastfeeding in Taiwan in general, so we can compare breastfeeding rates in this group with the wider community.

P9. 2nd para refers to “field observation” which has not been previously mentioned. Has this been published elsewhere? Or can it be discussed further?

P9. Worksite breastfeeding promotion. “improving the breastfeeding behavior”. The authors cannot refer to “improving” behaviour as they haven’t given any indication of previous breastfeeding rates or behaviours.


Table 3. heading “selected by of policy” – reword. Also can the asterisks, etc, be clearer?

---

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 whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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