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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper; particularly as it comes from country where maternal mortality rates in the surrounding regions are so high. The rationale for the study is well-established, that is we should be encouraging women to use professional attendants at birth by providing respectful and well like care. This is particularly important when death rates are high.

The paper assumes however, that the Respectful Maternity Care charter, is the only way that the quality of care can be understood or recognised. It is rather the principles that are embedded within this charter that are well-known and inherent in good quality care. These principles would be identified in any country seeking to provide high-quality care, but may not be thought to be necessary to articulate by health workers.

The context to the study has been well established and the rationale for sampling as participants health professionals as well as women seems reasonable. However, the assumption that the categories from the Charter necessarily mean the same to both groups of the participants needs defending in the text. For example, that confidentiality, means the same is it at least arguable and needs defending. Case conferencing or getting advice from a more experienced expert is one-way health professionals keep care safe. This may mean sharing information in ethical way. It is not clear in the paper if this differentiation has been made in the questioning and it seems to be treated the same way in the analysis. Also, by assuming the categories in the Charter are the appropriate ones for analysis, creates some other artefacts in the data. For example, 'the right to be free from harm and ill-treatment' might be a given and understood by health professionals, many of whom would take an oath on graduation to promise this. It is hard to imagine a professional health worker being employed or admitting that they would behave otherwise. Therefore, their data may not necessary emphasise this or be reliable. However, this category does makes sense for a woman using this system.

Sampling has been done carefully and thoughtfully, as has the choice of method (for example interviews rather than focus groups in some cases) used to elicit data from the participants in a suitable manner.

This article has been well written and edited; however I would prefer not to have the initials KII, FGD and IDI used in the text.
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