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Reviewer’s report:

General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The text still needs to be proofread for grammatical and stylistic fluency. There are a number of misprints.
UNICEF is nowadays said to stand for United Nations Children's Fund (the paper's version is true but old).
Table 5 needs a label to say that the brackets are percentages.

The results section is still short on information about choice of home delivery, relying on the statement "I prefer home delivery". The discussion section about this has been expanded, but presents findings (top p20) that are better placed in the results section. The authors should move them there. I suspect that the real problem with the study - which makes it hard to answer its purported question about reasons for choice of home delivery - is that it would have been better to do a qualitative study if the authors really wanted to answer it. Women were asked a number of questions by interviewers who had had one day's training, and the depth of the responses was not sufficient to make any solid statements. It is this that gives the reader an odd feeling, since, as I said before, the paper says it is about the reasons for home delivery, but it isn't. It's really about care practices. I agree with the authors' idea of doing a qualitative study. Perhaps the answer to this problem is to downplay even more the question of reasons for home delivery, present the findings in the results section, and say in the discussion section that the authors intend to proceed to an in-depth qualitative study.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)