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Reviewer’s report:

I really enjoyed reading this paper; it addresses an area of interest in modern maternity care and it is very well presented. My reservations lie in relation to some of the finer points of the methods. How many women provided information about the types of search terms they might use in undertaking an internet search? Exactly how was this information obtained? Was it through some general questioning of the group overall as part of the course of the class and is that why ethics approval was not obtained? (I would probably require clearance for this at my institution.) Also a reference is required for the previous study that identified keywords. I am also concerned that while the codes were decided by a team, the interpretation appears to have been done by one investigator. Is this right? Did anyone independently check the interpretation at all? All of this is compounded by the fact that the sampling frame is somewhat confusing. Purposive sampling criteria were used but apart from the source of site, the other criteria are not provided. The authors refer to a sample and a final sample. What are these exactly? How are they different? How many sites were identified from which the sample of 10 was selected? A comment is also made about content analysis. This is a particular type of qualitative analysis and it was not undertaken in this study. Overall, I think this is a very useful study and the findings need to be disseminated but the nature of the methods and the potential limitations need to be clarified.
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