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**Reviewer's report:**

This study evaluated the improvements in quality of care and management of eclampsia patients by criteria-based audit (CBA) in a low resource setting after implementation of recommendations from an initial CBA. The following are suggestions/questions to address for improvement of the manuscript.

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

1. Please clarify whether/how Institutional review Board approval was obtained for the retrospective portion of this study (at the time of the audit), which would require extraction of data from medical records without patient permission. Was there a waiver of patient consent? Or was the data de-identified using an “honest broker” system?

2. Please include in the Methods section the definition, and inclusion/exclusion criteria, for classification of eclampsia and pre-eclampsia with appropriate reference(s). Admission diagnoses (page 5) are very often incorrect. Hopefully these were not used as final diagnosis for the audit. Please clarify this in the manuscript. Did the authors use a review panel to confirm by chart review the patient diagnoses/outcome retrospectively? This would seem to be critically important.

3. Table 3: What is the explanation for the apparent differences in maternal age, parity and gestational age from Initial Audit to Re-audit? Could this have biased the results?

4. The overall reason(s) for the study (high eclampsia case fatality rate) should be mentioned in the Abstract.

5. What was the rationale for restriction of the study to eclampsia (as opposed to pre-eclampsia) cases only? In this context, please explain and correct the statement “All cases with eclampsia/preeclampsia that were admitted to the labour ward at Muhimbili National Hospital (MNH) during the study periods were included.”

**Discretionary Revisions:**

1. The sequence of events of the study (perhaps as a diagram) needs to be better described. Please describe when the initial audit, re-audit, data analyses,
interviews, etc. were performed.

2. The manuscript has numerous typographical errors throughout and should be thoroughly reviewed to eliminate these.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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