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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the effort in conducting this work and for submitting this manuscript. I agree with the investigators that evidence-based guidelines are not optimally adhered to, leading to substandard care and a gap between evidence-based medicine and clinical application. This is why this work and similar work is important.

I have few yet critical queries:

1. In the methods section

A. International literature was searched: Please detail the methods of search activities for example was it a systematic comprehensive search? was there any language or date restrictions? How were the publications screened?

B. Kindly do not discuss the content of the retrieved literature in the methods eg., Actual care was particularly not in accordance with guidelines with regard to the high risk identification and documentation of policy for PPH on the outpatient clinic and during labor, vital signs monitoring, and the different steps in the management of PPH.

C. The authors only provided general terms for their additional search in phase 2. A clear line by line search activities should be provided as a supplement for all search activities.

2. In the results section: authors should not discuss their findings. Discussion should be in the discussion section


4. I am not sure what exactly is the tailored strategy developed. Figure 2 needs to be clearly explained and detailed in the narration. This is the core of the whole work.
5. Finally, it is true that this work would be meaningful when tested regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed strategy in the clinical practice.

**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.

No

**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:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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