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BMC Pediatrics

This is a study whose aim was to examine the differences in parenting styles among primiparous mothers of different age groups that had infants of 0-23 months in Canada. Kim et al found no significant differences in positive interaction parenting styles among the maternal age groups although some characteristics were uniquely present in some.

The paper is well written and makes a significant contribution in the arena of parenting dynamics. Reading through the paper, a few points need to be clarified as listed below in order to improve its readability.

1. One of the independent variables under the maternal health and social characteristics needs to be clarified. Perceived health status has been dichotomized into "Good/Fair/Poor Health" on one hand and "Improved Health" on the other. While this might make perfect sense to the authors, it seems to raise a question regarding its definition. It is interesting how both "good health" and "poor health" status are grouped together yet the two lie on opposite extremes of a health status scale. And even then, "Improved Health" is not quite the opposite of (or does not lie on the same scale as) "Good/Fair/Poor Health". The categorization is thus confusing and authors are encouraged to re-define or clarify the meaning of this discrepancy.
2. Under results, paragraph 1, please swap the sentence beginning on line 16 with that beginning on line 18.

3. Under the results section paragraph 2 from line 14, the statement starting with "Focusing on child characteristics….." is confusing and requires clarification.

4. In the conclusion section, authors have over-emphasized the significance of "Improved health", which predicted positive interaction parenting differently between teen and advanced age mothers. Yet in results section, this was shown to have small effect size of (0.20), a value that is right at the edge of significant interpretation (but meaningful all the same). Furthermore, the exact definition of "Improved Health" relative to other categories is not clear as pointed out in (1) above.

5. The title of the paper could be revised to "Characteristics of positive-interaction parenting style among primiparous teenage, optimal age and advanced age mothers in Canada".
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