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Reviewer’s report:

This paper describes the findings of a quantitative cross-sectional study conducted at a major public hospital in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, which focused on satisfaction with intrapartum care among recently delivered women. The study is well justified; as the authors describe, satisfaction with healthcare is a major determinant of continued use and with improving the proportion of facility-based deliveries a current focus in Ethiopia understanding satisfaction is warranted. Overall, this manuscript is well presented. The analyses are appropriate for the study question, and the authors place the study findings in context. The manuscript could be improved with more clear definition of the satisfaction variables in the tables, a stronger rationale for the dichotomous satisfaction variable and how the cut-point was chosen, some further detail about the representativeness of the study sample, and some deeper discussion about the disparity between their findings and other studies conducted on the same topic in Ethiopia.

The paper would also benefit from close reading and editing by an English language expert to check for grammatical errors and to correct for the use of multiple tenses throughout the methods and results sections.

Specific comments, questions, and suggestions are given below by manuscript section.

Abstract:

1. Giving the cutpoint (4.20) in the abstract is a little confusing without full explanation of what the Likert scale questions looked like. I might suggest removing this from the abstract.

2. AOR needs a definition with first use

3. The results highlighted in the abstract should be re-considered and perhaps replaced with others. The finding that all separated women were dissatisfied is based on an extremely small amount of women, as was the government employee finding.

4. The authors state that "only" 24.4% of women with secondary education were satisfied, however this is somewhat misleading because satisfaction was actually higher among those with secondary education than those with lower educational attainment.
5. In the last sentence of the results section, the authors state that time after admission and short length of stay were positively associated with satisfaction - this should be re-phrased. They were associated, but not all variables listed were in a positive direction.

Background:

6. It would be helpful to present information - if the authors have it - on current repeat utilization of delivery services. This would better frame the issues - are women currently not returning based on lack of satisfaction in this setting?

Methods:

7. There is a reference (22) given in the power calculation section. There is no reference 22 in the reference list.

8. It would be helpful to understand where the 61.9% satisfaction estimate given in the power section came from.

9. In line 37, page 5 the authors refer to inclusion criteria. Were there other inclusion criteria other than those given in Line 9 (just having given birth after admission to the maternity ward)

10. It would be helpful to see more detail about the process of adaptation of the questionnaire. Who were the 'group' who reviewed the instrument (what experience/qualification did they have?). What specific modifications were made to the survey instrument?

11. What does "after discharge while being in the ward" (line 6, page 6) mean in terms of the timing of the questionnaire administration?

12. What was the rationale for using a mean +1SD cutoff for dichotomizing satisfaction? Is this a standard approach? How was the cutpoint of >4.20 then operationalized? Did participants have to get 4.2 or higher on all questions? Or was it a mean of at least 4.20 across all questions? I would like to see some evidence that this is a valid approach to dichotomizing satisfaction.

13. Was there any testing of the construct validity of the sub-scales described in lines 51-57 (page 6) completed? i.e. was exploratory factor analysis completed to ensure the validity of these subscales for this specific population? Reporting the Chronbach's alpha within each subscale would be helpful to answer this question.

Results:
14. In Table 1 some clearer definitions of categories are needed. Specifically - what does private mean for occupation? Does no formal education always result in someone being illiterate?

15. In Table 1 some of the sub-categories are very small, for example 8 women were separated and 2 divorced. What was the rationale for not collapsing these women into the single category?

16. The numbers in each group do not always add to the sample size reported in the methods. Were women excluded only if they were missing satisfaction measures but allowed to be missing some of the demographic information?

17. Significance of the difference between groups in terms of satisfaction could be given in the text (lines 7-15; page 9) and table 2 using chi-square analyses.

18. On page 10 (line 26) the authors state "Variables with a small number of success (<10) in each category were not considered for analysis" - having low sample size in a group does not reflect the "success" of a question. Perhaps this could be re-phrased?

19. On page 10 (line 37) the authors indicate that the multiple logistic regression can be found in Table 3 - this should be changed to table 4.

20. In Table 3 factors need much better definition. It is unclear what "Seek to Talk" means and what "Expected Labor" means. Does "Number of Delivery" mean parity? What do "Time to see Professional" and "Length of Time" mean? The definitions of each of these should be made very clear so that the table may stand alone.

21. On page 13 (lines 59-61) the units for time of admission should be clearly stated. What did a 1 unit increase actually mean in terms of minutes? Same question for length of stay in the hospital (line 4, page 14).

Discussion:

22. Line 35, page 14: the authors describe a prior study conducted in Ethiopia in which satisfaction was 61.9%. The authors should reflect more in the discussion about the source of the difference between this finding and theirs. Was it a different setting, different study population?

23. The authors also describe other Ethiopian studies (line 54-57, reference 10) how was this study new/different compared to those previously conducted. What does this study add?

24. What is a business score card (line 20, page 15) and how would it help increase satisfaction/decrease waiting time/length of hospital stay?

25. In general - what are the authors recommendations for improving satisfaction with care? What areas need additional research/attention?
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