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Reviewer's report:

General
The paper needs to be able to stand alone without readers needing to access the detailed report of the RCT - see comments below about the intervention.

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

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

In methods: The intervention needs to be described in more detail. Were the topics introduced in a structured format, were there specific teaching materials and leaflets that the mentors used? Or was it all based on them remembering information from their teaching sessions?

In the results: 'Fetal behaviour scans' are mentioned - were they an extra bonus of being in the trial or standard care?

Midwives also seem to imply that they thought the intervention was a structured programme. If it was not, then this should be highlighted.

In discussion: Peer mentors should be providing evidence-based information and advice not just that based on personal experience. Their personal experience may add to what they say but should not be the basis of their information.

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

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

In results: External influences - involvement of others - 5th line of this paragraph- 'Women reported THAT one-to-one visits'..

Authors contributions: CM analysed and coded (delete DID)

The contribution of MC has been duplicated.

HH ..'the randomized controlled trial WITHIN which this took place.'

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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