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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Ms Janelyn Ann Cruz  
The editorial board,  
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth,

Dear Ms Ann Cruz,

Thank you for your comments on the manuscript we submitted. We have revised the manuscript in line with your suggestions and made the following changes:

1. Introduction: We have mentioned in greater detail the implications of not following less than best practices, for practices such as episiotomy and enema. The outcomes of not observing evidence based practices such as episiotomy and enema, such as greater perineal trauma and unpleasant experience of childbirth making it less acceptable for women have been described.

2. Introduction: We have tried to explain the conditions under which the augmentation of labour is carried out in low income countries (as a routine, without proper indications, without monitoring of labour and in facilities without access to caesarean section), and its implications to perinatal mortality. We have also provided more references highlighting the association between augmentation of labour and perinatal mortality.

3. Methods: We have described the design of this intervention, which was an intervention to improve the quality of childbirth practices, and mirrors an uncontrolled before and after health system intervention. We have also accordingly changed the title to reflect this.

4. Methods: In the section on ‘Building consensus and defining the intervention’, we have described the process of how the problems were identified, using literature review, and experiences of observing deliveries in facilities.

5. Methods: We have specified the process of identifying the 19 evidence-based practices.

6. Discussion: We have discussed the limitation of this intervention, which was designed to be health system intervention. We have also mentioned why we believe that changes occurred due to this intervention.

Please let me know if you require any clarifications.

Best regards.

Kirti Iyengar
Coordinator,
Reproductive Health program, ARTH