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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a terrific intervention study. Additional clarity about the conduct of the trial and additional details about the participants and groups will be helpful to readers. Please consider providing a free link to the curricular material.

What is a "factorial" trial? This is not a term in frequent use and some explanation would be helpful. Although not an aim of the study, it would be reasonable to include as a limitation that there is not follow up of feeding method choice postpartum. Another limitation that should be noted is that the results are only generalizable to a population similar to the one studied, which is another reason that the demographics should be described (for both father participants and male facilitators).

The difference between "FIFI" and "PIFI" and "FFABC" are not completely clear. Please explain so that the current study is easily understood (is it individual or group, for instance). It is difficult to understand what the actual intervention is.

If the male facilitators were peers, does this mean that most fathers had a university degree or were enrolled in a degree program?

Is there a demographic description of the father population? Is there a record of the number of groups and how many participants per group? Was there any difference in responses between fathers from different facilitator groups?

It is an interesting and important point that using powerpoint was not apparently as effective as a conversational style. This accidental finding could potentially receive additional discussion.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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