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Reviewer's report:

1. General impression
   Much improved and well readable. The novelty of Birthing Plans as an artefact for handover is both interesting and important.

2. Originality
   Good idea, the question is an original one.

3. Structure
   Generally well-structured, and good to read.

4. Title
   The title describes the content of the study.

5. Abstract
   Ok.

6. Background
   Background gives a good overview. Aim of the study and its impact is described.

7. Methods
   The approach of the study is described in more detail, which makes it much clearer what has happened.

8. Results/ Essential revisions
   The quantitative style for the presentation of qualitative data makes it difficult to assess the meaning of the results, as also quite a number of women (35+6+4) did not (agree to) join in the study. The findings are interesting from a qualitative perspective: what are the thoughts of women on handover and to give ideas for improvement. Although, it would have been even more interesting to read how women had phrased there views themselves through citations. However, the findings can not be generalized, therefore, the numbers are too small.
   Some results are still presented rather strongly/general, while only a small number of women brought these forward:
   ...."Being involved in shared decision making with clinicians was specifically mentioned (7%;n=2). Understanding current management decisions (10%; n=3) was a particularly important factor when the management plan was constantly
changing (7%; n=2), as regularly happens during labour, as it may impact on patient-authored Birth Plans (3%; n=1). Similarly, to participate in shared decision making was considered reassuring or useful by the patient (10%; n=3).”

9. Discussion
The discussion has been much approved. Especially, adding a paragraph on limitations.

10. Conclusion
The conclusions reflect the results and the adjustments are positive.

11. Table/ Figures
Table 1: ok.
Table 2: ok.

12. References
Correct

12. Grammatical errors/ typos
The writing is acceptable.

13. Ethical issues
Correct

14. Recommendations details

**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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