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Reviewer’s report:

The vast majority of comments of the first round have been addressed satisfactorily.

Major Compulsory Revisions

(1) I still think that all indicators used in the results section need to be introduced and explained in the methods section, or in box 1, or in a supplementary box. I think it is a valuable principle in scientific writing that first methods are described and explained, before results are reported that are generated by these methods. Why make an exception in this paper, and introduce indicators in the results section? If the authors think this would make box 1 too unwieldy, this should consider a supplementary box. The paper can only win by such enhanced transparency.

(2) The authors should elaborate on the "convenience sampling" they used. What prevented them from obtaining a representative sample of eligible hospitals - costs? distance? security? better access because of personal relationships with staff? Out of how many eligible hospitals were the six hospitals selected? How, according to the authors, may this sampling method have biased the results?

(3) The authors appropriately state: "Our study was conducted in only six hospitals in Baghdad; therefore our results cannot be generalized to the overall country." This limitation should be reflected in the title: Instead of "Maternal near miss and quality of maternal health care in Iraq" it would be preferable to write "Maternal near miss and quality of maternal health care in Baghdad, Iraq"

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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