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Reviewer's report:

This paper builds on the recent World Health Organization recognition of the important role TBAs in supporting maternal and child health in resource poor contexts. The authors conducted a secondary analysis of papers identified through two systematic reviews that examined the effectiveness of interventions to find new roles for TBAs on maternal and newborn health outcomes, as well as papers identified through a systematic mapping of the maternal health literature. Define the acronym SBAs early on… I know it means Skilled Birth Attendants

I think the authors should think of a table clarifying their methods of selecting papers. Three set of papers are use. For the additional primary 6 and 14 papers, it will be good to explain using a table how many papers were identified and how they were ultimately scaled down to 6 and 14. I have to read thrice to make sense of the authors' methodology. A process table could help clarify what they did and help us understand the inclusion and exclusion criterion of the 6 and 14 papers, how they were found, and the search platforms used etc.

It will be good to reflect on the different types of TBAs covered the reviewed studies. In some instances and contexts, TBAs are professionals and constitute an identifiable group. In other contexts, TBAs are relatives of pregnant with some experience in supporting delivery.
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.

No

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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