Reviewer’s report

Title: Sexuality among Fathers of Newborns in Jamaica

Version: 2

Date: 2 December 2014

Reviewer: Ellie McDonald

Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
This is an important area of study, as discussed by authors. It was also excellent to read about the Jamaican cultural context, and to have the results of the current study embedded within this context.

Page 5 lines 15-23 and page 6 lines 1-6:

• Given the questions were administered within a day or two of the birth of their baby, I have some concerns with the period being studied being termed ‘peripartum’ which can refer to variable time periods before and after birth. 1, 2 It is important to make explicit the timeframe your work is relevant to (which is largely antenatal) given it includes only a day or two of postnatal time. The literature around women’s sexuality in the early postpartum period generally refers to much larger periods of time such as 3 weeks (Elliot) 4 weeks (gjerdingen) (hyde) 8 weeks (Glazener) (Schytt) 3 months (klein) 6 months postpartum (reference Barrett, serati, brubaker, buhling, signorello).

1. occurring during the last month of gestation or the first few months after delivery, with reference to the mother. (Miller-Keane Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Medicine, Nursing, and Allied Health, Seventh Edition. © 2003 by Saunders, an imprint of Elsevier, Inc. All rights reserved.)

2. occurring during the last month of gestation or the first few months after delivery, with reference to the mother. Dorland's Medical Dictionary for Health Consumers. © 2007 by Saunders, an imprint of Elsevier, Inc. All rights reserved.

• I felt there needed to be a much clearer statement of aims, which were mixed in with other statements. The current text is fairly vague and unspecific. Please state more explicitly the factors included in association. It is also preferable to include a justification for the inclusion of said factors.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

• Are the biological father’s in the study first-time fathers or do they have other children as well?

• Were the interviews face-to-face, or self-report written questionnaires, or both?

• Information relating to the appropriateness, implications and reasons for the recruitment method decisions are better placed in the discussion section of the paper.
Page 9 Lines 16-17:
• Please reference the ‘relationship quality measure’.
• Please include psychometric properties of all measures (e.g. reliability, validity, including population validation)
• For the Brief Male Sexual Inventory there are deviations from the published paper, please describe fully.
• Is there a reason Father’s mental health data was not included? Father’s physical health data?

3. Are the data sound?
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Overall comment: Authors’ general approach to the statistics appears to be ok, with some questions about table 3 (to follow). I understand that there were some issues with formatting tables, which were difficult to read and interpret. It was possible to do a number of things to make it easier, for example for asterisks it is possible to make them superscript, and reduce font. Data need only be reported to 2 decimal places.

Specific comments:
Table 1: include timeframes for measures, and title not descriptive enough.
Table 2: Title needs to be more descriptive
Table 3: Is GLM appropriate for these data? Regression not appropriate for ordinal / categorical data. Can there be a combined continuous score for each scale? Does the Brief Male Sexual Inventory give a total score? If not, alternative approaches appropriate for ordinal/categorical data need to be made.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
These results provide an unusually large, quantitative look at men’s sexuality during the peripartum transition in Jamaica, offering helpful insight to would-be parents, clinicians or others seeking to anticipate the effects of fatherhood on men’s sexuality. I think the authors go beyond what their data can provide with the conclusion to their abstract. As the data was collected within a day or two of their baby’s birth it is difficult to see what insight can be provided in terms of the effect of fatherhood (given it is a day or two long) on men’s sexuality.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
There needs to be comment on the extent of missing data and how it is handled. Authors do acknowledge limitation of data to the peripartum transition, but this needs to be made more clear throughout the paper.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
both published and unpublished?

Background literature is well cited. As stated previously there needs to be better description of the scales being used in this study.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

The limitation of the postnatal period being looked at needs to be more explicit in the title and abstract. Once the objectives and aims are expressed more clearly in the paper the abstract results and conclusion section should be reviewed as well.

10. Is the writing acceptable?

The paper is well written and easy to read.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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