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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: What is your overall impression of the study?

This study aims to assess exclusive breastfeeding self-efficacy by adapting and validating an instrument. Exclusive breastfeeding is important for early infant nutrition; so development of reliable and valid measurement is welcome.

The authors have written the article well, explaining every detail of the methods, with comprehensive results. Overall, this manuscript should be published with some minor revisions and clarification.

* What have the authors have done well?

Authors have provided good background and rationale.

Authors have performed face validity, factor analysis and construct validity to modify and develop the scale.

The results address the objectives and have been presented clearly, with balanced discussions and limitations.
In what ways does it not meet best practice?

I have pointed out some revisions/clarification. There is not any strong ways that the article does not meet best practice.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Some minor comments/clarification (see below)

Abstract:

Method:

Line 58: Who are the experts; if authors, replace by 'We'

Line 60: What is NCT02925429?

Line 77: Since this study was performed in Uganda setting, the adaptation can only be to similar context, not elsewhere. Please modify it.

Background:

Line 92: exclusive breastfeeding rate remain.....

Line 107-108: Please explain more where (for which population) the BSES-SF scale were developed and intended.

Line 118-135: This paragraph is more relevant to methods section.

Line 152-154: What is the mode of data collection? Please explain. Also exclusive breastfeeding should last up to 6 months; what is the reason behind excuidng data from 6 months?

Methods:

Line 159-160: what are the items added and modified; and how did the authors arrived to this? After doing this, how many items were there? Please explain. Is their agreement among four experts on the addition and modification?
Line 179-185: Did the breastfeeding characteristics and measurement differ to the self-efficacy measurement tool? If so, what?

Descriptive analysis:

Line 193-194: Usually, socio-demographic characteristics of sample is included; but why extra (health and breastfeeding behaviour variables were included whereas there is not mention in the objectives?)

Line: 195-297: I think authors should shorten description of these methods to make them more concise.

Results

It is good to start the results with participant characteristics. I think the scale adaptation (line 300-313) is more suited to methods.

In Table 1, the breastfeeding characteristics variables are not readily understood; are they from a scale? Besides the sub-heading is about participant characteristics. Also, Exclusive BF Self-Efficacy Scores; is it different from BSES-SF?

Line 352-357: It is good to know which items were deleted? Were they those who were added or modified?

Line 389: Heading of Table 4 is not in appropriate place.

Overall the results should be made concise without describing or commenting the findings, which should be done in discussions.

Discussions:

Line 477-483: Please also comment upon how the final 9-item EBFSES-SF is different from BFSE-SF in construct and relevancy to measure exclusive breastfeeding. What is the advantage of reducing the original scale?

I don't understand why some items in Figure 1 were crossed; similarly also in other supplementary tables.

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

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

Yes

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
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