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Referee's Report: A much valued tool that also brings ethical dilemmas - A qualitative study of Norwegian midwives' experiences and views on the role of obstetric ultrasound

I thank you for asking me to review this interesting manuscript that provided deeper insight into the end-users and professionals perspective of prenatal ultrasound in Norway. The studied offered critical information that has potential policy implication for reshaping antenatal diagnostics for Norway and other countries in the world.

I believe the quality of the paper will be greatly improved if the authors address some of the issues raised.

Specific comments:

**Abstract**

Page 1 Line 27-28: This should be rephrased "Midwives are the main providers of routine antenatal care services in Norway and routine fetal ultrasound examinations are also predominantly performed by midwives" to "Midwives are the main providers of routine antenatal care services including routine fetal ultrasound examination in Norway".

Methods: The sentences here did not flow very well.
Conclusion: Page 3 Line 50 - 51: I will suggest that you use "expectant mothers" instead of "expectant parents" if you are referring to the pregnant women.

Background
Page 3 Line 81 - It will be good to know the role of midwives and doctors in the use of ultrasound diagnosis in Norway. For example, the author stated, "The Norwegian regulations also stipulate that first trimester ultrasound and invasive prenatal diagnosis, such as chorion villus sampling (CVS) and amniocentesis (AC) should only be offered to women with conditions related to elevated risk of fetal anomalies, such as being 38 years or more (13, 14)" Can a midwife complete stages of ultrasound diagnosis for prenatal diagnosis in Norway? Or are there some conditions that might warrant referral to radiologist for complex decisions? Though the authors mentioned that the final decision rest with physician, but this need further clarification. This clarification will help to provide better understanding for ultrasound algorithm in Norway health system.

Methods
The authors should add FGD topic guide as a supplementary table if there is pressure of space in the manuscript.

Participant recruitment: Are there specific characteristics of FGD participants that were determined "apriori" to ensure homogeneity or were the FGD participants selected irrespective of cadre and years of experience?

Data collection and analyses:
More information will be needed on the followings: Who moderated the FGD? Was it the same person that moderated all sessions or how many people? How was coding performed - manual or software (Nvivo or Atlas or Excel)? How many people conducted the coding? How did the author organize their codes to achieve desired themes? What other roles did authors performed in the methods apart from sampling?

Results
Is it possible for the authors to provide more information on variability of perspectives that were presented as results for each theme? For example, it will be good to know the proportions that expressed their views including highlighting dissenting perspective(s).

I am still not sure from the results whether participants were talking about views of pregnant mothers alone or with their spouses on expectations/reaction to ultrasound results. It will be good to clarify this. If the information provided was limited to the views of pregnant mothers alone, then the author should include "none availability of information of spouses of pregnant mothers as a limitation".

Discussion
The authors said on page 24 that the results might to be generalizable? More explanation should be provided on this.

Assessment: Acceptable after attending to corrections
Yours sincerely,

Dr. Imran Morhason-Bello [Signed]
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