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Reviewer’s report:

Overall, this is an important study but the methods need to be better described, and more definitions included.

The preferred term is usually "respectful maternity care" as it is intended to encompass a time period and thus also a newborn/stillborn infant, rather than only the mother. If you are purposefully using the term "maternal" you may want to explain why.

Abstract:

- While we theorize that respectful care would lead to better maternal outcomes, I don't know that we have that evidence, so I would soften those claims.

- The sample size should be included in the methods and it should be clear that this was a survey.

- Results: Did you ask about "ever experience" of disrespect or during the last pregnancy? Some more definitions would be helpful.

- Conclusions: you state that poor access is an issue, but don't present any results on this.

Introduction:

P4 L69 - many authors have also noted the causes or possible causes of structural challenges, including under-staffing and poor facility space, that may lead to disrespectful care.

P4 L80- who opined that poor treatment was a reason for home delivery?

P5 L87- Caesarean/cesarean is spelled incorrectly

Methods:

This section needs the most work. How was the sample size calculated? It seems very small to me, and you make very large claims about prevalence and the representativeness. It's not clear if
you are asking about individual experiences, or general awareness. Wouldn't women who are presenting at PNC or immunization clinics have delivered at various places (facility and home)? Were these responses not stratified? How many clinics did you go to and how did you select them? Did you ask women about the types of facilities where they experienced disrespect?

P6 L115- please define "serially" - was every participant asked? did you have a researcher there all the time to not skip any? were there any refusals? who did the recruiting? were there any potential bias?

P6 L116- why are these called semi structured? it looks like the questions were only multiple choice.

P8 L147- "forms" should be "form"

The tables could use more information. How many people responded to each question? What was the actual question that was asked? For example, in table 3, how did you define disrespect and abuse, and in table 4, did you ask about personal info or just knowledge of any one's experience? Table 4f needs a better title. Both Table 4f and 5 seem like they would be good as open ended questions, but these were actually multiple choice, correct? For Table 5, were respondents asked how to improve services in general or specifically how to reduce disrespect? It would be a unique finding if promptness was organically raised by many responses despite that not being asked about previously.

Discussion:

-I don't think your thesis is actually that obstetric abuse is structural violence. That's not the argument made throughout the paper, but rather you present some descriptive findings from one region.

-How can you be so confident that the prevalence of disrespect and abuse is 19% in all of Ile-Ife? You haven't presented enough reason to believe that your sample represents the whole population with a small sample.

-I'd be a bit careful with the comparisons between studies, since they may have used different definitions of disrespect and abuse. This could explain some of the difference in the Enugu study perhaps.

-P15 L216 - what policy brief are you referring to? and why do you imply that this would change policy? is it somehow linked to clinical guidance or some type of intervention?

-Quite interesting if midwives perceive more disrespect than women themselves, seeing as the midwives are the providers... did you consider interviewing providers in your study?

-In the conclusion, you refer to your study as a baseline - does that imply that you are intending to carry out an intervention and an endline study?
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