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Reviewer's report:

Title: Waiting for attention and care: Birthing Experiences of Women affected by obstetric Fistula in Tanzania

The authors have described a study to examine the provision of emergency obstetric care in a Tanzanian community using selected Fistula patients as a convenient sample. Understandability so as Fistula patients are the group that missed death narrowly despite the poor obstetric services. However the study lacks focus as it attempts to study all major gaps in the provision of obstetric care in the locality and so makes it voluminous for an article other than a review one but yet fails to provide unique solutions to the problems already known in the field.

Major Compulsory Revision.

The topic! “Waiting for attention and care: Birthing experiences of women affected by obstetric fistula in Tanzania” appears to suggest that these women have gone through another birthing process after the previous ones that lead to the affliction of obstetric fistulae. I suggest it should be changed to: Waiting for attention and care: Birthing experiences and delays that lead to/ended in obstetric fistulae in women in Tanzania.

Abstract

The reason for this study was not given in the background. How does this add to our present knowledge?

Method:

What criteria led to the selection of these 16 patients for the in-depth interview and not the rest of the other 151. What went into the selection of the 151 for the quantitative work? Randomly selected? What were the enrolment rate? Did some women declined to participate?

Results:

What is unique in the birthing experience of these women to others who had various undesirable outcomes? Or is this group just a convenient sample to examine the quality of obstetrics service in general in the community?

What is novel about this analysis? The authors did not clarify. Is it solely that it was done in Tanzania?
There were a few typographic errors

Discretionary Revision.

Was it possible to have compared this group’s experience to another group that had another undesirable outcome e.g. still birth without a Fistula?
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