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**Reviewer’s report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. The recruitment of women into the study is still unclear:
   The revised version states: “318 women who attended the maternity ward were consecutively invited by their midwife to participate in the study”.

   Women attending a maternity ward are usually in-patients admitted for a specific reason and thus a highly selected group. Woman attending an outpatient-unit (Ambulanz) for routine antenatal care are a different group and according to the comments to the reviews, it looks that these women were asked to participate and not those in the ward. Women may also attend antenatal classes in a hospital or for booking, only. In any case, it should be clarified, why women asked to participate attended the hospital in the first place, as routine antenatal care is usually provide in out-patient settings at private offices. Was there a specific problem or reason for referral, or just routine care?

2. The folowing first section of the part “study population” in the results should be moved to the methodology.

   …Study population
   Of the 318 potential participants, 38 (11.9%) declined, 29 (9.1%) insufficiently completed the questionnaires and 30 (9.4%) decided to give birth elsewhere. The final sample included a 8 total of 221 from 318 women (69.5%) ……. There is also a issue about why women who delivered in another hospital were excluded, as the study does not refer to pregnancy outcome data or uses any data from follow up visits.

**Discretionary Revisions**

Conclusion: With 4 clinically relevant dimensions, a satisfactory internal consistency and first results on its external validity, the CTDQ is now open for further studies in the field of labor.

…..would be better to use “ in the field of delivery care”

**Minor Essential Revisions**
The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

Discretionary Revisions

**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:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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