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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The three step process to generate 30 structure and process quality indicators addressing birth centre care is clearly outlined and transparent with Figure 1 providing an overview of the decisions supported with explanations in text. Tables 1 and 2 also demonstrated the domain, ratings, consensus (%) and decisions based on consensus for round 1 and 2.

Two determinants appear very similar (continuous presence of a healthcare provider during labour AND maternity care assistant present during labour). For an international audience, can a statement be included in text to justify including these two items as separate determinants. Perhaps a definition of what a maternity care assistant is in the Netherlands might clarify why a separate item should be included for this role?

Are all birth centres in the Netherlands physically adjacent to a hospital or on the same site? If not, and some birth centres are physically independent of a hospital then one determinant "indoor connection between birth centre and hospital" may not apply. Please comment.

Line 177 - ... a statement is made that client experiences were not included in the second round. However, one determinant is 'structural research on client experience' which seems to contradict that statement on line 177. Please comment.

Under the heading 'determinant selection by Delphi consultation' one long paragraph (over 1 1/2 pages) is included. Could this please be divided into several shorter concise paragraphs?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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