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Reviewer's report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

The study considered patient satisfaction with breastfeeding education at the Royal Women's Hospital in Melbourne. A small sample of mothers was evaluated (n=129); the sample included mothers who attended a meeting in September 2005. This study is simply a marketing survey. No outcomes were linked to the services provided. The question was well defined but the results were not informative.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The nature of the support program was not well defined. There is no description of the services rendered.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

No. The response rate was 60.5%, typical for a mail survey. Only 129 mothers from a potential 2,029 who participated in the whole year were considered. It is not possible to determine:

1) whether or not the sample size was representative of all participants
2) whether the responders were different from the non-responders with respect to demographic characteristics.

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

Yes, but only for market research interests.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

No. The authors reported in the abstract that most responders were clearly satisfied with the support. However, less than half (only 49%) indicated that they were satisfied.
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

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

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
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Please number your comments and divide them into

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Must link services with specific outcomes such as increased breastfeeding rates or increased duration of breastfeeding.

2) The authors must describe the services rendered.

3) The authors should consider a larger, possibly more representative sample.

   The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

- Minor Essential Revisions

   The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

- Discretionary Revisions

   These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the
authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

What next?

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)
- Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Health Services Research will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)

This is a small marketing survey that considered a very small, possibly unrepresentative sample. The findings were not impressive.

Level of interest

BMC Health Services Research has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.

- An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Cell, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, British Medical Journal)
- An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in its field, such as Immunity, Development, Journal of Clinical Investigation, Gastroenterology)
- An article of importance in its field
- An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- An article of limited interest
- An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English
As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published
- Acceptable

Statistical review

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

Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?

No.

If you feel that the manuscript needs to be seen by a statistician, but are unable to assess it yourself then please could you suggest alternative experts in your confidential comments to the editors.

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
- Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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We ask all peer reviewers of medical papers to declare their competing interests in relation to the paper they are reviewing. The peer reviewer declaration is included in the report bearing your name that will be sent to the authors, and published on our website if the article is accepted.
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