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BioMed Central Editorial Office

To the Editors at BioMed Central:

Thank you for your kind review of the manuscript, “Access to Essential Technologies for Safe Childbirth: A Survey of Health Workers in Africa and Asia” (Manuscript ID 4416603817402726). We are delighted for the opportunity to have further strengthened the paper with the suggested revisions. Please find the revised manuscript enclosed.

The following revisions were requested:

Reviewer 1 Comments

There are still some flaws in the english, the grammar and the layout of the paper. The paper needs some minor editorial work, best achieved by giving it to a reader who has not seen it before and can comment on the readability, flow and ability to understand the flow of ideas.

We appreciate the concern of the reviewer. We have edited the grammar, readability, and flow of the paper throughout. We also had the paper reviewed and edited by an independent reader (a native English-speaking, public health professional who had not seen the manuscript previously).

ABSTRACT Paragraph 1
The background first paragraph should read: ....is essential to ensure successful childbirth practices proven to prevent....

The suggested modification has been made. The sentence in the Abstract paragraph has been edited per the reviewer’s suggestion.

MAIN PAPER
Please review the paper for grammar and excessively long sentences (which as a general guide need not be over 2 lines long)

The paper was reviewed as suggested by the referee. Long sentences were edited to decrease sentence length.

METHODS
The note on unsafe abortion is not a method. It is part of the background or part of the discussion. There are other statements which the authors might consider removing from the methods, where they "discuss" rather than "state" the methods.
Modifications were made as per the reviewer’s suggestions. The sentence regarding unsafe abortion was moved to the Discussion section. In addition, as suggested by the reviewer, a sentence that discusses the major causes of maternal and neonatal mortality was moved to the Background section.

RESULTS Paragraph 1
End of paragraph one is discussion not an objective statement of results.

The modification has been made as per the reviewer’s suggestion. The sentence in question was moved to the Discussion section.

RESULTS 3rd paragraph states there was a trend towards better availability. This statement needs to be clarified, i.e. compared to what? (one assumes size of health centre) ...

The modification has been made as per the reviewer’s suggestion. The sentence was clarified in terms of what is being compared.

DISCUSSION
End of first paragraph: Please replace "institutions" in sentence...."Approximately half of global deliveries take place in institutions." This needs to read health care facilities. (or a similar term)

The modification has been made as per the reviewer’s suggestion. The word “institutions” was changed to “healthcare facilities”.

Thank you, again, for your kind review of this work.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Reisman, MD, and co-authors