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Reviewer's report:

Review:

Use of alternative and complementary therapies in labour and delivery care: a cross-sectional study of midwives’ training in Catalan hospitals accredited as centres for normal birth.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

My main comments are that this study is poorly defined. The inclusion of water immersion, warm compresses and TENs etc are not usually defined as complementary therapies. I think your definition is not clear and very diverse.

There are objectives but no aim

The methods are written like an abstract

The major issue is there is no definition of training. How for example do you have training to apply warm compresses to the perineum?

How were the training hours worked out? It seems that most midwives would have put down a guess as there is no training for many of these things considered to be standard midwifery care.

I actually don’t understand the purpose of this paper and think it is fundamentally flawed

Other issues:
Can you define an Autonomous Community for non Spanish readers?

How does a hospital get accredited for normal birth? Aren’t all hospitals facilitating this?

Your tables have commas instead of decimal points and SD should be in brackets.

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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