

January 9, 2008

Dear Dr. Dougherty:

Attached is my revised manuscript NRES-D-07-00194, titled "Impact of Birth Trauma on Breastfeeding: A Tale of Two Pathways". Please thank the reviewers for the obviously time and care they devoted to my manuscript. Their detailed comments and suggestions were extremely helpful to me in strengthening this revision. Below I have listed my point-by-point response to the two reviewers. The problem, however, is that in trying to address the reviewers' excellent suggestions the manuscript is now 2 pages longer than it originally had been.

Reviewer #1

1. Breastfeeding has been added in the background of the abstract.(p.3)
2. Description of the issues related to traumatic birth has been added in the problem statement. (p.5)
3. Review of the literature has been revised. Studies on postpartum depression and breastfeeding have been deleted. Added is the connection of the study's concepts plus a summary at the end of what is known and the gaps in the knowledge base. Some new 2007 references have been added. (pp.6-8)
4. The sections on research design and data analysis have been rewritten (pp.9-10). In order to prevent the description of Colaizzi's data analysis steps from being too similar to the "Anniversary of Birth Trauma" article, this information is now illustrated in a new figure. (Figure 1, p.29)
5. A new section entitled Methodological Congruence addresses the rigor of this study. (pp.11-12)
6. In the Discussion section, the two theme clusters are more prominently presented. (p.20)
Also in the discussion implications for clinical practice and suggestions for future research have been added. (pp.21-22)

Reviewer #3 General Comments

1. Rigor in the methodology and how it was achieved are addressed in the new section on Methodological Congruence. (pp.11-12)
2. Terms that this reviewer felt were more quantitative in nature have been changed. "Essential structure" which was originally used in the research question is a phrase of

Colaizzi's but based on the reviewer's suggestion this term was changed to "essence". (p.8)

The term "factor" in regards to the themes has been changed to "aspects". (p.13)

The way the results were originally presented, this reviewer stated that it appeared the themes were separated into opposing categories. This misconception was clarified and this section was revised. (p.13)

3. The section on phenomenology was totally rewritten (pp.9-10). Now it explains and references that Colaizzi himself labeled his phenomenology as "existential phenomenology" due to his agreement with Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of phenomenology. Colaizzi's method is a combination of interpretive and descriptive phenomenology.

Reviewer # 3 Specific Comments

1. Value statements which were judgments of the researchers were deleted such as "painfully" on p.3.

2. Term "factor" was deleted and renamed. (p.13)

3. In the literature review more specifics about the methodology of the studies were added such as sample size and country. (pp.6-7)

4. Birth trauma was defined. (p.6)

5. Regarding the sample, reference to the participant who had been contacted by phone conversation was removed since the reviewer felt the methodology was different (p.11).. Data obtained via the phone conversation was removed but this woman was still kept in the sample and only the information she shared over the Internet was included.

6. The research question was reworded to remove "essential structure". (p.8)

7. Information about the response rate of participants was moved to the section on sample. (p.9)

8. The table of birth trauma types was deleted and included in paragraph form.(p.8) With the addition of a new table on partial audit trail of data analysis and a new figure of Colaizzi's data analysis steps, the table on birth trauma types was deleted and the information was easily included in the text.

9. More description was added about the 19 mothers who were diagnosed with PTSD. Time to their diagnosis was included and also a note that 3 of the 19 women at first were given an incorrect diagnosis of postpartum depression. (pp.8-9)

10. Data analysis steps of Colaizzi are now presented in a figure. (p.29)

11. The phrase “collapsing significant statements” was reworded in the section on Results. (p.12)

A new table was added that illustrated a partial audit trail of the data analysis process. (p.32)

12. Adjectives, such as “vehemently” and “vividly”, that introduced mothers’ quotes were deleted. (p.14)

13. A new section on Limitations was added. (p.20)

14. Clinical implications were couched as suggestions. (pp.21-22)

15. “etc.” was deleted for example on p.17

16. Reference to Dickens was deleted in the Discussion section. (p.20)

16. The quote was deleted that had been included in the Discussion section. (p.21)