

Reviewer's report

Title: Women's and care providers' perspectives of quality prenatal care: A qualitative descriptive study

Version: 1 **Date:** 21 November 2011

Reviewer: Gill Thomson

Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a very well written paper, which provides clear insights into the methodology adopted, and the findings are well supported through the use of appropriate quote material. The in-depth nature of this work, combining service users and professionals' views is a particular strength of the paper, providing comprehensive insights into this area of study. There has been appropriate consideration of the findings within the wider body of literature, and the limitations to the research have, on the whole, been adequately addressed. I do feel, however, that a number of points should be addressed prior to publication, detailed as follows.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. A pseudonym or interview/participant number should be included after each of the quotes so it is clear to the reader that these views were elicited across a number of different participants.
2. The balance between the interpretations and quote material does need to be addressed for a number of the sub-themes reported – on occasion, this reads more as a list of quotes, particularly when quotes are reiterating the same points. I would suggest that the sub-themes are reviewed and the data is re-synthesised and/or further consideration of what the additional quotes offer to the interpretations is considered.
3. Whilst the 'meaningful relationship' is a key and important concept highlighted within this study, why were 'staff characteristics' (part of the structures of care theme) not considered to be of significance in this relationship – particularly when similar issues of trust are discussed in this section, and many would argue, that the staff characteristics are the basis upon which meaningful relationships are/can be forged?
4. Further details of what actual questions were posed (from Donebedian's model) during the interviews need to be included in the paper.
5. Needs to be explicit within the methodology section how many participants/who were involved in the study.
6. Check and remove references to wider literature when you are reporting on your findings (e.g. under emotional support sub-theme)
7. There is some slight repetition of points – e.g. on page 27, under emotional support, it refers to how reassurance concerning babies development leads to

women feeling 'cared for' – this point is also made within the screening and assessment sub-theme.

Discretionary revisions:

1. As the study states that a key aim of the research was to develop and test an instrument to measure quality of prenatal care –a few sentences to inform the reader about the next steps to be taken in this work would be useful within the discussion section.
2. Include full participant details within the table, e.g. where were the remaining 8 participants born?
3. A further limitation may be that health professionals requested/identified women to take part, which may have led to a sampling bias – this needs to be considered within the discussion section, together with suggestions for further research.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.