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Reviewer's report:

The authors are commended for addressing a significant health issue for childbearing women. This paper's purpose is to describe the development of an implementation strategy for a high resource obstetric setting to improve guideline adherence regarding PPH. Coordinating efforts to manage postpartum hemorrhage is key to minimizing related morbidity and mortality, so finding a way to improve PPH risk identification, intervention, and follow up is important. In addition, engaging childbearing women in tools designed for their benefit is a strength of this paper.

Following are a few suggestions for consideration to enhance the value of this manuscript:

1. **Background**: Although the incidence of PPH is reported as increasing, there may be reasons other than a true increase in hemorrhage. For example, the reported increase may also be due to a significant increase in attention to PPH. In some locations, there have been changes in the threshold of blood loss that then increase the rate. Substandard care for women who experienced 1500cc or more blood loss was cited in a review paper published over 15 years old. Are there any current references that support the theoretical basis for this work? The introduction/background should address literature regarding current guidelines, or lack thereof, in treating PPH to support why additional work in guideline development is needed. Linking guidelines development to implementation and then to adherence could be made stronger.

2. **Methods**: The description of the phases and the contents challenging to follow and tie back to the purpose. The following suggestions may increase the clarity: 1. The headings of the phases could be more reflective and clear as to the content of each phase. For example Phase one: Strategy selection does not tell the reader what to expect. The text also does not tell the reader initially as to what to expect in this section. The description of the search strategy was not specific. In phase two - clarifying what type of tools were being developed first, followed by a description about how each were developed would increase clarity. There were references to guidelines in the literature. The authors might consider if a table comparing the guidelines would be useful. This paper does not provide the final guidelines, nor does it provide the specifics of other available guidelines. Phase three: the process for feedback did not follow any particular framework. There were only physicians among the expert panels.
when other healthcare team members will likely participate prenatally, during labor/birth, and postpartum follow up - such as midwives, nurses, and possibly mental health counselors or others. The patient material should be evaluated from a health literacy and reading level perspective.

3. Results: The steps described discussed a process of development in contrast to the statement that a strategy to improve adherence to guidelines was created. A guideline does not ensure adherence, and link between the two was not make clear. It is also unclear what the tool are. Even if the tools cannot be shared yet, a general description of each tool and their components is needed (more detail). I am curious about the time out including the laboring women at the end of stage 1. If women have regional anesthesia, this might be practical. If they are unmedicated or using nitrous, this might not be a very practical plan - which then decreases adherence to the proposed guidelines. The checklist for PPH treatment is said to guide professionals through consecutive treatment options, etc.; however, few professional groups were represented in the creation. In addition, it is unclear on what basis a checklist for treatment was created since the evidence about "consecutive treatment options" based on comparative effectiveness is not strong (http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?productid=1918&pageaction=displayproduct)

4. Discussion: there is earlier reference to a treatment checklist, but in the discussion there is discussion about a PPH preventative care bundle. These terms/tools need clarification.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The work in reducing poor maternal outcomes related to PPH is important. The goal of determining whether there is an improvement in maternal outcomes related to the tools developed will certainly be of interest to those providing maternal care.
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