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Cover letter

We are pleased to resubmit our manuscript: “Experiencing challenges when implementing Active Management of Third Stage of Labor (AMTSL). A qualitative study with midwives in Accra, Ghana.” We again want to thank the reviewers for their valuable and helpful comments. Please find below our response. Changes are marked yellow in our manuscript.

Reviewer I: Susan McDonald

A minor correction, page 15-16, paragraph beginning Training sessions…., last line, the sentence appears to be incomplete. Suggest wording…the outcome, however, varied and depended on the initiative from the midwife responsible for training in the ward.

Thank you for the comment. We have completed the sentence, but with other wording than suggested (see page 15-16).

It may also be worth considering saying that as the study has clearly identified that training and repeated education sessions alone will not change practice. Identifying and embedding champions within the units appears to have a much greater effect.

We do appreciate the comment and have addressed the topic further in the conclusion (see page 23).

Reviewer II: Jill Durocher

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Introduction, last paragraph, pages 5: The authors state that no other studies of this kind have been conducted; however, several studies on adherence to AMTSL guidelines have been conducted, as they have cited in the prior paragraph. I would just suggest that they make the point a bit stronger that their study explored qualitative aspects and that they did not document level of adherence (or rate of adherence) among the surveyed providers.

Thank you for the comment. This has been clarified in the background (see page 5).

Methods, page 8, ethical considerations: It doesn’t seem necessary to state, “After AE and SS’s arrival in Ghana.” I wasn’t sure what this referred to at first.

This has been removed from the text (see page 8).

Conclusions, page 21: The ‘faith and fate’ discussion is interesting, but I don’t find it to be the central focus of the paper. Thus, I’d recommend that this issue be raised later on in the
discussion and not upfront. The paragraph on staff coverage seems more important.

*Thank you for the reflection. This issue is now raised later in the discussion (see page 21).*

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS**

Page 5, first paragraph: The first two sentences of this paragraph discuss implementation rates of 3% and 5% and the same citation [14] is used for both. Can you please clarify? Were there two separate studies on AMTSL practices conducted in 2007?

*Please see page 5 for clarification.*

Page 6, first paragraph: With regard to the highlighted sentence, “The interviews…were conducted…before the most recent modification of the AMTSL guidelines,” please clarify whether these refer to the national guidelines or international guidelines.

*Thank you for the comment. This is now clarified, see page 6.*