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Author's response to reviews:

Responses to Editorial comments

1. Study limitations do not necessarily need to be included in the abstract. This would give the authors room to mention their key findings about the importance of interpersonal factors in maternal satisfaction with care.

We have removed the limitations from the abstract and added to the limitations section on page 21. We have added a couple of lines in the abstract on the interpersonal aspects of care, in the results and conclusion sections [p2 line 19 – p3 line 13].

2. A final careful editing of the English language for grammatical correctness is needed.

The manuscript was carefully edited for grammatical correctness and hopefully is of acceptable quality now.

3. Please provide citations for the conceptual frameworks the first time they are mentioned.

Reference has been added to the first mention of conceptual frameworks [p5 line 5].

4. Be more clear about what exceptions are made to the PRISMA reporting guidelines.

The exceptions were on reporting of meta-analysis or other summary measures. But since we did not conduct them, they’re not applicable in our case. We have modified the text accordingly [p5, lines 21-23].

5. It would be clearer to speak about the strength of associations between the determinants and maternal satisfaction, rather than just the “strength” of the determinants (page 6).

The text has been modified to make it clearer [p6 lines 1-2].

6. Although the limitations paragraph is appreciated, it is more about the limitations of the literature than the limitations of the current study. Please add
the limitations of your systematic review methodology here (not in the abstract). A few lines on limitations of the review methodology have been added [p 21 lines 8-15].