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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor reports:

1. There are some minor comments which remain from the reviewer (see end of email). Please address them and amend your manuscript accordingly.

2. Please move the statement "A written description of the research, including intent to publish, was provided to the participants, and informed consent was collected." to the "Ethics approval and consent to participate" section.

In the "Consent for publication" section, if your manuscript does not contain any individual person’s identifiable data or information, please state “Not applicable” under this section.

Authors’ response: The statement "A written description of the research, including intent to publish, was provided to the participants, and informed consent was collected." is now moved to the "Ethics approval and consent to participate" section (p.26, line 21). We also stated that the "Consent for publication" section was not applicable (p.27, line 2).
3. Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

Currently, the contributions of author MO do not automatically qualify them for authorship. Please provide clarification on their contributions, or remove their name from the list of authors and place them in the “Acknowledgements” section instead. Please note that any changes in the list of authors requires the completion of the “Change in authorship” form.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data, writing of the manuscript or general supervision of the research group - alone - does not usually justify authorship.

Authors’ response: MO helped collecting and analysing the data. It has been added in the “Authors' contributions” section (p.27, line 11).

4. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

Authors’ response: Figure 1 appears now in a separate file and the title appears after the References (p. 31).

5. Please ensure that all figures/tables and supplementary files are cited within the text. Any items which are not cited may be deleted by our production department upon publication.

Authors’ response: The Figure 1 and the Tables (1-2) are cited within the text.

6. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Authors’ response: A clean version of the manuscript has been uploaded on your website. Figure 1 has also been uploaded as a separate file.
Reviewer reports:

7. Lorraine Walker (Reviewer 1): The authors have been very responsive to reviewers' comments. Well crafted manuscript.

Authors’ response: Dear Lorraine, many thanks for recognizing our efforts.

I only have 2 minor editorial suggestions:

8. p. 14, line 21: English needs correcting: "Plus, mums would have be visited...."

Authors’ response: The sentence “Plus, mums would have a visit and they would actually be less isolated” has been changed into “Plus, mums would at least have a few visits and they would actually be less isolated” to fit more accurately with the French expression (now p.16, line 1).

9. P. 19, line 20: make clear what "nothing" refers in 'they rejected the idea that "there is nothing" after delivery.': Is it that they are rejecting that there is nothing challenging or requiring education and support after child birth?

Authors’ response: Women explained that they were well surrounded during pregnancy and well prepared for childbirth but deplored feeling alone after the delivery. Indeed, there was much less medical monitoring for the mother after delivery while, during the pregnancy, they had regular appointments with their gynecologist. Mothers have the impression that medical appointments after childbirth are targeted at their baby and not at themselves. An “authors’ note” has been added p.20, line 16.