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Author's response to reviews:

Experiences of non-progressive and augmented labour among primiparous women.
A qualitative interview study in a Grounded Theory approach

Thank you for the reviewer's comments and for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We found the reviewer's comments interesting and relevant and we agree with the needs for revision.

We have made revisions as recommended please see below.

Yours sincerely
Hanne Kjaergaard

Reviewer's comments and our responses

1. The aim of using grounded theory methodology is to develop a theory. This is in this paper described under headline: "Outline of a theory". A figure (Figure 1) is added the manuscript but not mentioned in this section. Our response: The figure is now mentioned in the section "Outline of a theory"

2. In the text, at the end of the description, the concept "to create reconciliation" is described and fit very well in the description of the theoretical structure. However this is not shown in the figure where the concept "Acceptance and satisfaction" is used. Our response: We have added "reconciliation" in the figure and also revised the figure's legend. Also in the abstract the word reconciliation is mentioned but there is a somewhat not comprehensive sentence starting with: " The process embraced a conflict and reconciliation .....". To conclude, the theory is not clear enough in this mentioned aspect. Both texts in abstract, result and figure should be modified. Our response: We have modified the text in these sections

3. The discussion is interesting especially the theoretical comparison with Hegel's theory of dialectic. However the discussion should be modified as a consequence of the altered theoretical structure. Our Response: The discussion has been restructured and clarified especially on the synthesis/reconciliation and we have added an extra reference.

4. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? Yes the research question is well defined. However I do not find the phrase "to gain theoretical understanding", clearly expressed. What is theoretical understanding? All qualitative research, no matter method, aims at gaining understanding. In addition most qualitative research (sometimes not content analysis) aims at identifying theoretical concepts or theoretical structures. I find the word "theoretical" as dangerous and unnecessary to use here and propose that it should be taken away. Otherwise there is need for explication of what "theoretical" means. Our response: The word "theoretical" has been deleted.

Editor's comments and our responses:

A. Formatting changes: Our response: We made the manuscript fit into the template's headings and
sections and we made adjustments according to the author's checklist for manuscript formatting. We divided Table 1 into two tables.

B. Ethics and consent: Our response: We added a sentence on this in the Method's subsection.

C. Language: Our response: The manuscript has been revised by an interpreter with English as his mother-tongue.