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Exploration of perceptions and decision-making processes related to childbirth in rural Sierra Leone

General comments

In view of the high value the work promises to add to existing information on health care, especially on childbirth in Sierra Leone, I recommend that it should be accepted after the revisions suggested are satisfactorily effected.

However, the authors may need to present the paper in a more concise way to reduce the number of pages. I observed that there are too much extra-explanation which may not be necessary.

In addition to the comments made on the manuscript, few other comments are highlighted below:

Abstract

The result section of the abstract should be re-cast to highlight major findings of the authors. These findings should be reported in such a way that the readers of the manuscript will easily identify them as responses of the respondents (participants) and not the perception/idea of the authors.

Methods

Line 131-138: There is the need to state the total number of participants used for this research. Also, a descriptive table showing some demographic characters such as age and sex of respondents per group interviewed will better present the total number of individuals used per group. This descriptive table could be better placed in the result section.

Data analysis: While the earlier parts of the method section describes the means of data collection, data analysis should be concise, presenting the methods by which the collected data were analysed. The authors presented some codes used in the data analysis; however, the result section failed to give the result of the codes in form summary table(s). This is necessary to further authenticate your research work.

Results

Result statements should be presented in such a way that the readers will easily identify them as statements of findings and not ideas of the authors.

I suggest that the inclusion of statements of respondents be removed as these
were statements from individuals which may be ambiguous. These statements are better only in the summary form as result statements.

Conclusion
Conclusion should be made more concise.

References
References should be written to conform to the journal's author's guide.

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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