Reviewer’s report

Title: Process evaluation of a community-based intervention promoting multiple maternal and neonatal care practices in rural Nepal

Version: 1 Date: 12 June 2009

Reviewer: Reija Klemetti

Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is well written, the topic is interesting and the intervention implemented important. My major comments relate to the structure of the paper, mainly the structure of the Methods and Results sections. Please find my detailed comments below.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Introduction: is far too long. Can be easily shortened.

2. Methods: should be described more clearly. The moment version does not clearly explain what has been done and how it has been done. It could be useful to prepare a table or figure of three different phases in which the authors could explain or describe the main topics of each interviews at each phase. The second table could be prepared of the background of interviewees (seventeen respondent in the first phase – who were they, where they are from etc., 29 FCHVs in the second phase – any information available about them? and 23 women in the third phase – from Jhapa or Banke, age of the mothers, primi – or multiparas etc, description of other family members). Furthermore, more information is needed from the interviews: was the pilot made and if not reason for that and if yes, how it was, who did the training and where, where did the interviews occur, how long did they last etc. Analysis of data should also be described more detailed. When the method section is clearly described the results can be presented accordingly.

3. The results: should be reorganized and rewritten. It might be better if the results presented the topic by topic by each phase. Information given from the first phase is poor. Some part of results section should be presented in the method section (how to test the usefulness of the cards, and format and utility of the booklet, questions asked etc.) – only results should be described in the result section.

4. Discussion: this section could be modified after modifying the method and result sections: short summary of the findings, limitations of the study (nothing in the moment version), strengthens of the study, findings compared to the findings of other studies, conclusion (presented well in the abstract) and suggestion for further studies or practical implications (one-page booklet of the government is an interesting result of the project but what else?).

- Minor Essential Revisions
1. Title of the article: I’m not sure whether the title describes the content of the article. Do the authors have any other suggestions? The authors could consider what they evaluated – the process, the intervention or something else?

2. The reference list: mainly well done but number 27 should be completed.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. The cards: it was interesting to see one of the cards (Figure 1). Could it be possible to add more cards (or pictures) from different topics?

**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.
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