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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this paper that concerns obese women's experiences of breastfeeding. While there are some interesting insights offered, the quality of the manuscript requires improvement before it is suitable for publication. Suggested revisions have been offered as follows:

Abstract

"and long-term health for both mother and child" - need to check and reframe this text - doesn't quite make sense in this context.

Definition of obesity needs to be included, i.e. BMI of??

Conclusion - Sentence starting....'However, there were practical challenges...' I would add in 'for obese women here' so context is clear.

Background

Use % rather than percent, i.e. line 38, p. 3, also need to remove 'the' in this sentence, i.e. .....13% of pregnant women ......

Over-use of acronyms - please write in full for majority of the ones included, i.e. GWG, BF (BMI is fine as well known-established one), rest are confusing/unnecessary.

As second para of background is presenting and then negating potential association of BMI and breastfeeding - it would be clearer to sum up positive and negative evidence in separate sections - and potentially a rationale for why negative results/no association was found (particularly when your study is based on the premise that this is an area worthy of exploration).

A rationale for your study (rather than just only a few done) would be useful here, e.g. no studies undertaken in Sweden, explored issues at different time-frames??
Methodology

Participants - participant details should be included at the start of the findings section and ideally should include a detailed demographics table. Age of most recent child at the time of the interview should be provided.

How did Weight Watchers staff identify women to take part (i.e. identifying the BMI scores?)

p. 6 line 113 It's not really that written material will be confidential (as for example you are intending to report their data in a public domain) - rather should address how anonymity was obtained?

p. 7 line 122 would rephrase 'Interesting subjects in the data' to 'Key issues reported in the interviews……'

p.8 line 130-131 check/revised last sentence.

Who were the pilots undertaken with? Did these lead to any revisions?

Need to state where/how ethics approval was obtained (and if not, why not) - not just that you adhered to ethical principles.

The lettering A-K is used as participant identifiers - this is not clear in the text.

Findings

It would be useful to actually link/name the sub-themes in the introductory text for each of the themes so as a reader it is clear what is going to be discussed (this applies to all the three themes).

Line 162 - 'best for the child' (rather than for the child's best?)

Line 199-201 - check/re-frame text (last sentence).

Line 218-219 - check/re-frame text (last sentence) -the following quote also doesn't appear to support the preceding text?

p.223 - text feels rather repetitive with earlier para/points made this page - i.e. poor attachment at the breast - would look at revising the text/use of quotes in this section.

p.13 - quotes should ideally be better integrated, i.e. rather than discussing various issues and then listing quotes below (this also applies elsewhere in the findings).
Again issues are being repeated i.e. emotional impact of not breastfeeding has already been addressed in 'unmet expectations'.

Discussion

You should start this section with a clear summary of the key findings from your study and then link into wider literature in proceeding paragraphs.

Overall, this section is long and repetitive, e.g. issues of closeness/attachment referred to on pages 17 and 18. The discussion should not be a complete reiteration of all the findings (which is how it reads at present), but rather highlighting/discussing key issues, how your findings support or refutes other literature and what new insights your study has generated. As many of the issues you identify are similar to other/non-obese women's experiences it would be more appropriate to just summarise/contextualise these findings (with links to wider literature) and then focus more on issues/difficulties that obesity causes for these women.

Credibility does not generally refer to the number of authors undertaking the analysis - rather that plausible/credible interpretations have been generated.

Further clarification about the need for further research to focus on the body would be useful - for what purpose?

Grammatical errors:

Please note that I started to highlight grammatical errors - however, there are too many for a reviewer to address. Careful checking/review by an English native will help.

p.4 line 59 - sentence starting 'high concerns…..' unclear what these concerns are relating too - body image??

p.68 - would change the term 'probably' to 'potentially'.

p.73 - reframe 'failure initiation' to 'non-initiation'

p.6 line 101-20 - should be framed as 'purposive sampling' and 'Weight Watchers organisation'

p.6 line 106 - should read 'were given' not 'were giving'

p.6 line 107 - change text to 'and a total of 11 women …..'
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