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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is an interesting study which explores well the experience of labour and delivery from these two groups of women.

**Major revisions**

1. The methods used are appropriate for this study. However, they need some clarification in the methods section. There is lack of clarity when there is discussion of links with the wider RCT.

2. The date(quotes) are sound – although often there is no link between the paragraph before and the quotes used – needs some linkages adding

3. The discussion and conclusion are relevant to the results – although more linkages referring specifically to the data would help to see where the discussion points come from.

4. The limitations of the work are stated. However, I think a further limitation that ought to be considered is that of interviewing before discharge, it may be that women feel unable to be open whilst still an inpatient, also the euphoria of birth may still be affecting their accounts.

5. A previous study was referred to in the discussion which this study supports – but more details needed to be able to consider the implications of this.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

6. The title is a good reflection of this study. The opening paragraph of the abstract is confusing and needs clarification and the grammar needs some checking.

7. The English, grammar and typing errors throughout sometimes make this a hard paper to read. This needs some work with special note being taken of the abstract, do the authors really mean pain prevention or management, I am unclear about the word ratter in this context. There needs to be opening paragraphs and summary paragraphs at the end of each results section to make the clear the points being made and improve the overall flow of the paper.

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