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Abstract:

Well-written

Introduction:

Strong introductory paragraph, presenting the rationale for father involvement with breastfeeding.

Introduction follows a clear a logical structure and is easy to read, leading ultimately to the study's specific aims.

Method:

Participants - it is noted that participants were eligible if both partners intended to participate in the rearing of their child, does this mean that separated, divorced or non-residential couples were eligible for participation? If so, are descriptive statistics available on how many fathers participated from separated, divorced or non-residential families?

Intervention - Table 1, Activity 3, Key messages, Please correct "4 out 5" to "4 out of 5".

It is mentioned that all but one of the trainees (an international student) was deemed competent enough to deliver the FFABC and two trainees withdrew for personal reasons. Please consider whether it is necessary to state the study status or the reasons for withdrawal of these trainees. Given the small number of facilitators, I am concerned that this information may make individual trainees identifiable.

It is mentioned that participant feedback was return to the facilitators. Was participant feedback provided in paper-pen written format? Was it anonymous?
On page 10, a 'training' session is mentioned however the use of inverted commas and description of this session indicates it was a follow up, feedback or check in session. Please consider re-wording to improve clarity.

Para 1, page 12 - potentially identifiable information provided about facilitators (international students who had returned to their home countries).

Para 1, page 13 - please note at what point data saturation had been reached.

Results:

Para 1, page 15, Peer facilitator experiences - potentially identifiable information provided about facilitators (family commitments, personal health reasons).

Well written and clear summary of themes.

Discussion:

On page 21, "These US studies focused…" and on page 24, "…specific to the father focused breastfeeding class…". In some parts of the manuscript, you spell 'focussed' but here it is spelt "focused". Please use consistent spelling.

Please be consistent in how "father-focused" / "father focused" is written.

Limitations: intervention and assessment was limited to the antenatal period. Impact of FFABC on postnatal breastfeeding outcomes unknown.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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