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We are grateful for the reviewer's thoughtful comments, and have responded to each below.

**Reviewer:** Denise Lawler  
**Reviewer's report:**  
Minor Essential Revisions

The authors have successfully addressed the issues identified in previous review.

There are a few formatting errors e.g. extra spaces in abstract and (in line 175), that should be addressed prior to publication.  
**Response:** Thank you, we have corrected the spacing in the abstract and the above line.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field  
**Quality of written English:** Acceptable  
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.  
**Declaration of competing interests:**  
I declare that I have no competing interests

**Reviewer:** Deborah Turnbull  
**Reviewer's report:**  
Discretionary Revisions

Thank you for the opportunity to re-review this paper. While all of my comments have been dealt with, I still have some reservations about the way that the sampling frame is labelled. To describe the approach as 'purposeful criterion sampling' while at the same time, noting it as 'convenience' based to my mind is quite contradictory. Indeed I have briefly examined the reference provided which seems to suggest that a convenience sample is a separate approach. Given that the women were sourced from an existing study and not in an ‘ad hoc’ manner, I would not label the sample as convenience based, which implies a lower level of quality.  
**Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have revised the wording to describe our method as "purposeful criterion sampling".  
Also I think it would be useful to explain exactly what criteria were used for the sampling and make an explicit comment in the discussion that saturation was not a specific goal of the sampling approach. My understanding is that saturation is not restricted to grounded theory approaches.  
**Response:** Thank you for helping us to clarify this point. We have added (lines 208-211) in an explanation on the criteria used for sampling (All women and midwives who were English-speaking and had completed GPC at the midwifery clinic in Ontario that had recently established GPC were invited to participate. A purposeful criterion sampling approach was used [19] choosing these groups because of the characteristics they represented in terms of the early implementation stages of GPC.) We added an explicit comment in the discussion stating that we did not aim to reach saturation in sampling.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
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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