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Reviewer's report:

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review the paper "Process evaluation of text-based support for fathers during the transition to fatherhood (SMS4dads): mechanisms of impact”. This paper addresses an important yet neglected topic. Overall, the paper is very well written and aim, methods and findings are clearly presented. My specific comments are provided below. Since no page numbers were added, I started numbering from the title page (i.e. page 1).

Abstract: In the Introduction it is stated that fathers received 182 text messages (not 184).

P.3, L.48: It is unclear what is meant by "meta-analysis rate”. Please elaborate or rephrase.

P.4, L.10: What type of risk are you referring to here?

P.4, L.14: Bracket of reference is missing.

P.5, L.23: The statement to identify "drivers of behavioural or cognitive change" is unclear. From the current paper it is not obvious whether or not "change" was assessed in the SMS4dads study and if yes, how. Liking the current paper a bit more to the previous publications would strengthen this part and provide readers with the necessary background knowledge. Similarly, before going into the details of the Methods, it is important to provide readers with more information about the program outcomes relevant for the SMS4dads study. Some information is presented at the beginning of the Result section but could better be introduced here.

P.10, L.35: There is a formatting error.

P.14, L.14: Is there a reason "safety net" is presented in bold?

P.16, L.48: Is "entering a set of new practices" the best word choice?

Table 1: When were those characteristics measured? At the same time as the interviews were conducted (i.e. conclusion of receiving the messages)? Add statistical tests used to compare interviewed dads and those not interviewed. Test statistics are presented in the text (page 5) but not currently referred to in Table 1.
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

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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