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Author’s response to reviews:

November 4, 2016

To the Editors of BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth:

We are pleased to submit our updated article manuscript entitled “Development and validation of a short index to measure the quality of care processes at and immediately following delivery in sub-Saharan Africa.”

Thank you for providing the Editor Report for the revised manuscript, submitted in October 2016. The changes made to address editorial requests are itemized below. Page and line numbers below refer to the revised documents. The manuscript files submitted do not have changes tracked or highlighted.

Editor Report

1. Tanzania is the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Zanzibar is not a protectorate of Tanzania. So just mention Tanzania, that is enough throughout the manuscript (in abstract, page 8)!
Response: The description of Zanzibar as a protectorate was added at the request of Reviewer 2. This description has been deleted throughout the updated manuscript. However, because the Zanzibar survey was conducted separately from the Tanzania Round 1 survey and the samples were combined for analysis, the reference to a Zanzibar survey is retained in the description of methods.

2. Background, page 4: don't use "developed and developing countries" change into "low and high income countries", throughout the manuscript (also page 22).

Response: References to developed and developing countries have been deleted throughout the manuscript and replaced with the requested terms.

3. The text on page 11 is also as a footnote to the table (footnote is not necessary)

Response: Footnotes 2 and 3 to the table on p. 10, containing duplicative text, have been deleted.

4. Results, page 14: you state: "is identical to the sample used in an earlier study". I would say: "in our earlier study", because you have referred to this many times.

Response: The cited phrase has been deleted on p. 14 and replaced with the suggested language.

5. Table 3, page 15: if I add 706+558+626+347, I get 2237 instead of 2,238 and if I add 282+220+403+210, I get 1115 instead of 1145!

Response: The sample size values have been corrected on p. 15.

6. Discussion, page 21: "generalizeability" should be "generalizability" (two times line 365 and 369).

Response: The spelling has been corrected on p. 20 and 21.

7. Please adjust the references: don't mention more than 6 author names and when more than 6, put 3, et al. Thus e.g.nr 48 Souza JP, Gulmezoglu AM, Vogel J, et al.
Response: All references with more than 6 author names have been updated to the correct format.

Sincerely,

Vandana Tripathi, MPH PhD

Phone: +1.917.532.1731 | Email: vtripathi@engenderhealth.org