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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to once again review your manuscript and thank you for all the work you did to address the previous reviewer comments. You have done a good job of clarifying certain things that were opaque in the last version; specifically the descriptions of the data collection study tools and some further details in the discussion section. I think this is an interesting study, the results of which can add valuable information to the body of literature we have on increasing breastfeeding self-efficacy and rates. However, overall, I would still say that this manuscript requires significant editing to make it as impactful as it could be. I include some of my suggestions and comments below:

Page 9 Line 17-35 and Page 9 Line 45-55 seems repetitive and I think they could be condensed to be more clear.

Page 10 Line 2-7 - this says that the participants could contact the researcher about breastfeeding problems but in your response to my previous comment I understood that the participants could only contact the research with questions about the information that had been presented. I think your response to my comment was clearer than when you currently have in the manuscript and I would suggest you edit it to be more like your response (We gave an opportunity to the subjects who did not understand the information given in the face to face counseling, booklet, or videos to make a contact with the first author for further clarification only through a phone counseling.”.

Page 10 Line 54 to Page 11 Line 10 - Were these assessments done on the pre-test results? This section should be re-written for clarity.

The Results section still needs clarification on whether you are discussing pre or post-test results. Line 38-43 on Page 12 should be re-written for clarity since it is one of your primary findings. And also on Page 12 Line 43 there is a typo in the word 'significantly'. On Page 13 Line 1 - do you mean higher self-efficacy at prenatal or postpartum testing predicted a higher level of EBFing?

Although you have added to your Discussion section and clarified certain sections, there is still a need to link or situate your findings within the broader body of literature. It was not always apparent why you decided to include certain other research or whether you were referring to your results or the results of other studies. It would be good to further understand how your research findings add to the existing body of knowledge.

For example Page 15 Line 7-24 - It was not clear to me why this research was included and how it added to your discussion.

Page 18 Line 1-5 - while I agree with this statement it is not apparent to me how the study supports the idea of extending interventions from the pregnancy period through to the postpartum since as I have
understood it your intervention was confined to the prenatal period.

Finally, your Conclusion section could be re-written to be more powerful and more effectively capture the findings of your research.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**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.
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**Quality of written English**
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