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Reviewer's report:

REVIEWER REPORT
(A previous unfinished report was written directly to the web form – but ‘disappeared’ – that one is superseded by this version).

1. This is a timely and well organised paper reporting on a most interesting piece of research.

2. The implicit research question is well enough stated (p. 2 lines 6-7) although I would have thought that this paper on organisational change is in fact examining the ‘close interplay between professional and management projects’? Moreover, within the paper the study reveals tensions intra-professionally between the ward midwives and caseload midwives which is not overtly taken up in the final ‘Discussion’ section.

3. On page 12 line 16 reference is made to far reaching implications for the private lives of midwives, this needs a little more explanation.

4. The qualitative methods and methodology are sound and the evidence presented is robust. Some of the English in the translation of respondent quotes could be improved e.g. p. 14 lines 12-14 commencing ‘There did not go much time from that …’

5. The discussion and conclusions certainly are reasonably well balanced and supported by the data but could be better argued. First, the close interplay referred on p. 28 line 19 is between professional and managerial projects – both concern organisational change – as stated by the authors on page 29 line 11. Second, the lack of any explicit mention of the intra-professional tension between the ward and caseload midwives needs to be remedied, as it reflects a crucial dynamic in the organisational change process – the implication being there may be greater potentiality for conflict intra-professionally than between management and profession. Moreover, it is a different dynamic to the stratification argument to be found within the work of Freidson and others.

6. The limitations of the study are clearly stated on page 30 starting line 20.

7. The authors clearly state and acknowledge all work upon which they are building – both within the references and the acknowledgements.

8. The title and abstract accurately reflect what has been found – EXCEPT the term in ‘organisational’ in the subtitle I believe should read ‘managerial’.
9. The writing is generally more than acceptable, but there remains a few infelicities in the text that need correcting e.g. page 11 line 18 ‘extend’ should read ‘extent’, p. 16 line 22 ‘was firs signed/not signed’ should read ‘was at first not signed…’ and on line 23 ‘life’ should read ‘live’. There are others too as well as the need to improve on the English in several of the respondent quotes.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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