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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript describing an important research question and intervention. Given our understanding of the many benefits of breastfeeding and the breastfeeding relationship on women and their babies, it is certainly important to understand more about what increases breastfeeding self-efficacy and duration.

Overall, I think your paper is well laid out and your initiative well described. I did find Figure 1 helpful in understanding the flow of participants through the intervention and your limitations section is well described. However, there are a few sections that require a re-write and the paper would also benefit from more detailed content.

Although your Background and Discussion sections attempt to situate your research within the existing literature, these sections should be elaborated on and more clearly described.

As noted in the review questions, there are several spelling, grammar and punctuation errors that affect comprehensibility that should be reviewed and corrected prior to publication.

The content of your methods section is appropriate but they are not as well described as they could be. I would suggest a re-write with a focus on clarity and fleshing out the details. Some of this may also become clearer as you edit the rest of the paper.

The Results section needs editing for clarity. Additionally, as you will see, I do not think that the conclusions drawn in the paper are adequately supported as you have currently written them. However, I do think that the data you have is rich enough to support some strong conclusions if you were to do a concentrated re-write.

I have certain specific comments and suggestions which I will list by Page and Line number. I hope they are helpful in focusing your edits and re-write.

Page 3, Line 10-17: Please clarify these statistics. Right now, this sounds as though 45% of ALL children are still breastfeeding at 2 years of age but I assume that it is 45% of the 40% of infants under 6 months who are exclusively breastfed.

Page 5, Line 5-6: Would it be possible to include the questionnaires as Annexes?

Page 6: I would appreciate more discussion of the validity and reliability testing.

Page 6, Line 49-50: I assume the …….PHCC is a typo. Please correct.
Line 54: Please clarify "they were masked on the detail information of the study".

Page 8, Line 9-16: Do I understand correctly that the intervention participants could contact the researchers via phone or ask for an in-person visit to help with breastfeeding issues postpartum? If this was the case, then there should be a discussion of how this may have positively affected the breastfeeding rates/results observed, and possibly had more of an effect that the educational intervention described.

Line 45: I assume this means an Independent t-test was done. Please correct.

Page 9, Line 28-30: I think the Discussion should touch on the fact that the higher percentage of extended family in the intervention group could have affected breastfeeding rates and continuation due to the fact that there may have been more older women to help and guide mothers along.

Line 33-34: I think there may be some words missing here? Perhaps "with the experimental group?"

Line 36-41: Could the attitude score have been higher in the experimental group at baseline because more of them already intended to breastfeed anyway, meaning that this may have affected the results seen post intervention?

Can you touch on this in the Discussion section, perhaps commenting on what societal norms of breastfeeding are within this community? I think a discussion of motivation/intention to breastfeed prior to the intervention might be useful.

At certain points in the Results section, it is not clear if you are referring to the baseline, prenatal or postpartum results. Please clarify.

Page 10, Line 1-5: This section needs clarification. Also, I think perhaps Table 4 is not the correct table to refer to here? I did not find it helpful in understanding this section.

Line 52-57: I did not find that the results or discussion sections adequately make a case for the intervention showing a statistical difference in terms of outcomes of self-efficacy. While I think this case could be made, the Discussion section should be edited to accomplish this. Overall, more discussion of the effect of self-efficacy would be helpful. For example: was high breastfeeding self-efficacy prenatally associated with higher postpartum self-efficacy because they had wanted to do it in the first place OR was postpartum self-efficacy higher at 2 months PP because breastfeeding was going well?

Page 11: Overall, the Discussion section needs a re-write. There should be more discussion and linking up with the results of your study and less listing of other countries where similar research took place or conflicting results without explaining the relevance.

Line 47-59: I did not find this clear. Perhaps re-write and include more of a discussion of the above mentioned note on self-efficacy.

Page 12, Line 14-32: For example, wouldn't we expect breastfeeding self-efficacy to change over time with or without the intervention? To first increase postpartum when things go well but then perhaps to ebb and flow with growth spurts of the baby? Perhaps unpack this a bit.
Line 42-50: Please re-word for clarity.

Page 15, Line 10-15: I see that you mention first-time mothers here but wonder why this factor has not come up before in the Discussion section or elsewhere as surely parity affects breastfeeding intentions and success; meaning if they have done it before, they may be more motivated and successful.

I wonder about how other factors might affect breastfeeding intention and success? Perhaps mode of delivery in addition to the others I've previously mentioned (family structure and parity). I think there should be more discussion of this.

Line 17-20: I did not find this clear. This seems to say that the intervention was extended into the postpartum period and refers to there being a short and a long intervention period but this is not what I had originally understood. Please clarify.
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