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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Harps Editorial team,

We have revised the manuscript as per reviewers’ comments. Our responses inserted in the manuscript are in blue color.

Hereunder find our point-by-point responses of the comments form each of the two reviewers.

I: Reviewer 1: Dillys Walker:

Major Compulsory Revisions - Background

1. Comment: First page. Second paragraph, needs a sentence to explain why the decision was made to remove immediate cord clamping.

Response: The expiation as to why immediately cord clamping was removed has been provided in the first page in the second paragraph.
2. Comment: Third paragraph. First sentence needs reference.
Response: Reference has been cited as suggested.

3. Comment: Fourth paragraph, last sentence, states study found use of AMTSL was “quite low”- need to state just what this means.
Response: The sentence have been rephrased to state what was “quite low”.

4. Fifth paragraph-.Need to state where study was conducted in the sentence that describes the aim. This is not stated until the second paragraph of the methods section.
Response: We have rephrased to state where study was conducted immediately after the sentence that describes the aim.

Methods section
5. Comment: Fourth paragraph. Were the observers trained in observational technique and if so, how?
Response: We have added a paragraph to explain training of observers in observational technique.

6. Comment: First paragraph page 4. States “the value was adjusted downward because health practitioners not managing deliveries directly were in included in the sample” I do not understand who these practitioners might be, and why such practitioners were included if they do not manage deliveries?
Response: We have rephrased this sentence to reflect what we really meant.

7. Comment: Under “health care providers” page 4. States the team interviewed 106 providers- I would like to know how many were physicians, nurse midwives, etc. Especially as the overwhelming majority of the observations were of nurse, midwife, and “other” provider deliveries.
Response: we have added two sentence to explain how many were physicians, nurse midwives, etc.

8. Comment: There is no mention of IRB or ethics or research committee approval for this work
Response: We have added a paragraph on IRB approval.

Results
9. Comment: The entire section that discusses “National standard treatment guidelines”should be integrated into the background. These are not results of the
study.
Response: We reviewed the guidelines and those were our results.
10. Comment: The last paragraph of page 4, first sentence describes the content of pre-service curricula for physicians and nurse midwives. This needs a Reference. Response: We have added the source of this review finding in the methodology section
11. Comment: Page 5 section “storage conditions”. It would be useful to have an overall assessment, such as “X% of facilities had appropriate storage conditions for oxytocin and “X%” for ergometrine”.
Response: We have revised the section and we hope that it is now understandable. As concerning whether the storage conditions are appropriate or not is now addressed in the discussion section.
12. Comment: Page 6 section “Use of AMTSL”. Paragraph 3. States that physicians were not observed. Why are they listed in the table then? Who are the “other” providers if they are not physicians, nurses or midwives?
Response: It is true that physicians (i.e. MDs, or Obstetricians) were not observed because our study focused on normal deliveries only. However, we observed Clinical Officers and we wrongly referred them as “Physicians” in the table. We have revised the table accordingly, to correct this mistake. The others category includes Assistant Medical Officers, Mother and Child Health AID, medical attendants, nurse assistants, and student nurses.
13. Comment: Various paragraphs would be better in conclusions. This needs to be reworked so that results and conclusions, or recommendations, are more clearly separated. For example, the third paragraph states recommendations. This is not a result and should be moved to discussion or conclusions
Response: We have revised the section to separate results, recommendations and conclusions
14. Comment: The 5th paragraph that outlines suggestions about harmful
practices and trainings. Again, these are not results.

Response: We have revised the paragraph to reflect the discussion properly.

15. Comment: There is no mention of limitations of the study.

Response: Table 2 is describing the practices that were observed during delivery in regardless of whether it was correct AMTSL use or not. The aim of the table is to describe what is normally practiced by providers.

Minor changes:
1. Comments: First page: First paragraph, second line is missing an “a” between “with case”.
Response: The “a” was inserted as recommended

Comment: third line. “Twenty five percentage” should read “twenty five percent”
Response: Corrected as requested

2. Comment: Next sentence should read “Recent information indicates that worldwide the percentage is even higher than previously thought, ranging from 30-39%”
Response: The sentence has been revised

Methods Section
3. Comment: First paragraph. Second line- “barrier” should read “barriers”
Response: This has been corrected

Results
4. Comment: Paragraph 2, line 6. Remove “the” between “regarding” and “all”
Response: Corrected as recommended

5. Comment: The second paragraph of this section, second sentence should be changed from “Oxytocin unlike ergometrine is only limited to hospital and upon…..” to “Oxytocin, unlike ergometrine, is limited to hospital use and only when prescribed by a physician”
Response: We have rephrased as suggested

6. Comment: Page 5 section “Availability of uterotonic drugs”. States misporostol is often available at research institutions. Were any of these in the sample? Please define MSD.
Response: No research institution was included in our sample. We have rephrased the sentence to correct this. MSD is Medical Store Department and this has been corrected as well.
II: Reviewer 2: Abel Makubi

Essential Revisions

B) COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS

2) Comment: THE ABSTRACT. Structured as it should be and contains adequate information about the study. Save for a few grammatical mistakes i.e. paragraph
Response: We have revised the abstract to correct the grammatical mistakes

1. Comment: The authors may wish to add a sentence for recommendations
Response: A sentence has been added for recommendations

Comment:

5) METHODS. The methods are appropriate but limited description. The authors should have pointed out the limitations of their study, the correction of which would make the findings and the discussion more informative.
Response: A paragraph of limitation has been added in the discussion section.

Comment: It is not stated whether there was ethical clearance obtained from the relevant authorities before the study was undertaken.
Response: A paragraph on how ethical issues were handled has been added.

Comment: Information on data management is also limited. How was the data analyzed? What statistical program was used? etc. Description of some terms could have appeared in this section and not in the results section. I.e. the researchers’ CCT definition, AMTSL A & B definitions, pre/in service midwifes and physicians etc.
Response: We have added information on data management and definition of terms has now been included in the methodology section.

6) RESULTS.

Comment: The data are fairly presented and address the objectives of the study but a few Minor Essential Corrections need to be dealt. For example, the statement that begins with “This is in contrast to FIGO/ICM……” on the last paragraph of page 6 sounds to be a discussion point and does not reflect the findings from this study.
Response: We have removed the sentence from the results section
Comment: Also the last paragraph on the elements of AMTLS which begins with "The percentage of deliveries ....... “on page 7 can be merged with the findings on the use of uterotonic drugs on the last paragraph of page 6

Response: The first sentence in the paragraph referred on page 7, have been merged with the last paragraph of page six concerning use of uterotonic drugs. However, the rest of the paragraph in page 7 is addressing the use of the drugs in relation to the given definitions of AMTLS. We therefore feel that it may be left in the paragraph for good comprehension.

7) DISCUSSION. Satisfactory.

Comments: Again, I can not avoid thinking this study had a number of limitations which could be discussed here for relevancy of the findings. The proposal statement to the MoHSW on paragraph 3 page 9 should be placed on the recommendation Section

Response: We have added a section on the limitation of the study as the last paragraph of the discussion section. We have summarized recommendation in one sentence and included this in our conclusions. Details of these recommendations have been re worked and embedded in the discussion.

8) CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Comments: This section needs Minor Essential Revisions. The major conclusions should be clearly highlighted instead of vague statements. The study has made important revelations which need solid recommendations for health policy makers

Response: We have reworked the conclusions.