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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)

Are the results well described and developed? (my own question not mentioned in the guidelines but necessary in a critical analysis.

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. 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 were the concept” Acceptance and satisfaction” is used. 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.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

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. When reconciliation is discussed there is other research touching childbearing women’s’ experiences. (For example Berg M 2005: Berg M. (2005). Pregnancy and diabetes –how women handle life conditions. J PerEduc 14(3):23-32).

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

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

1. 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.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Conclusion

Overall this is a very worthwhile study which should be accepted for publication after revision of theoretical structure and discussion.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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.
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