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Reviewer’s report:

Male involvement in birth preparedness and complication readiness for emergency obstetric referrals in rural Uganda

Dear editor,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript. Below please find my comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract – Since male involvement is part of the title, please include findings and a conclusion related to it.

2. Introduction – first paragraph, first sentence, please clarify: what do you mean when you say the global maternal mortality ration is 342, 900/100,000 live births. These seem to be two figures.

3. Introduction – I also fail to see literature on male involvement yet it is a major part of your manuscript. In general, please expand the literature including the local context i.e literature on Uganda or the region.

4. Introduction – the third paragraph about where you did the study should be put under the methods section with the title: study setting.

5. Methods section – please clarify in the manuscript how sample size was determined, and what strategy was employed to recruit participants. What was the exclusion criteria? Where there any dead at the time and if so how was data about them collected? Also clarify what was the operational definition of a) birth preparedness – did the mother have to have all the items you list?; b) How was male involvement defined?

6. Results – Some major issues here. The results seem to be so thin. In the tables, please remove the isterics before the variables and do indicate the n. In table 2, how was multiple responses handled? Please include in manuscript. And where are the findings of the multi-variate analysis?

7. Results – As I mentioned above, the findings are currently thin. Either additional analysis or collecting additional qualitative data could provide more insights into this important issue under investigation.

8. Discussion – Lots more work needs to be done here. The discussion should focus on the key findings in relation to the research question. Currently, the discussion is general and does have major similarities to an introduction section.
The discussion section should also include methodological issues or limitations.

9. Conclusion – This is also too narrow and sort of hanging. The authors would do readers a favour by suggesting what needs to be done to improve the situation.

Minor essential Revisions

1. Under methods, paragraph 2 – clarify if the data collectors who were health workers came from the same hospital, and if so, discuss this as a methodological limitations which could introduce bias.

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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