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Reviewer's report:

For Authors

I enjoyed reading your well written and argued manuscript. I have a couple of minor comments for your consideration.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
1. UK – in full

Background:
2. UK, NHS and NICE – need to be in full at first mention
3. 2nd paragraph. Last sentence. add in Victoria... A state-wide review of postnatal care in Victoria Australia
4. 4th paragraph. Should the phrase ‘lean thinking’ have capitals?
5. 5th paragraph (page 6). Is the statement in italics ‘necessary, but not sufficient’ a direct quote? If so needs page number.

Findings:
6. Response rate and baseline data: A brief explanation of the UK band system is needed. International readers may not understand what this means.

Discussion:
7. 1st paragraph 2nd sentence – very long. Needs rewording.
8. 3rd paragraph 4th sentence – very long. Needs rewording

Discretionary Revisions
9. 13th paragraph (page 23) – 2nd last sentence commencing As Glasziou… please consider rewording.
10. Check with journal – direct quotes under 42 words would normally be placed within the paragraph

Best wishes with this and future work
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