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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thank you for your positive reviews and suggestions. We have taken them into account and corrected our paper as such.

Below you will find our specific responses,

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Choolwe Muzyamba (PhD)

Reviewer 1: Kishwar Azad, MRCS,LRCP, FCPS, MSc, HonFRCPCH (Reviewer 1): This is just to inform the author that first person must never be used when writing an article

Thank you very much for your positive review. We have corrected it.

Reviewer 2: walaa abuzaid, MD (Reviewer 2): English writing needs to be more precise.
Some references are repeated in reference section.
References needs to be updated.
Thank you very much for your positive review. We have worked on the language and also corrected the reference

Reviewer 3. Jennifer Elizabeth Ayton, PhD (Reviewer 3): Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled Has the quest for evidence-based practice become pervasive in maternal health response in Sub Saharan Africa? the case of skilled maternal care in Mfuwe, Zambia. This study explores local people's views on the evidence-based skilled-maternal-care in Zambia using a case study- qualitative approach. It is an important study because it gives voice to the local people's views.

Thank you very much for your suggestions and your positive review

Title: perhaps review the title so that it is more succinct and includes the type of study. For example, The quest for skilled maternal care and evidence-based practice in Sub Saharan Africa: A qualitative case study

Or

Local people's views on the evidence-based skilled-maternal-care in Zambia: a qualitative case study

We have changed the tile

Abstract

Methods: include the theoretical framework here.

-This has been included

Findings: check the font as it looks like c) is different
Main body

- Theoretical framework should be heading not subheading

This has been corrected

- Methods

  - Start the Methods off with explaining the type of study
    - We have so

  - Perhaps put ethics at the end of the methods section
    - We have shifted it

- Page 4. Line 18-20 Table 1 shows the summary of demographic and social characteristics of the participants. This needs to be in Results

  - We have shifted it

Comment:

  - Best to write numbers out in full especially when starting a sentence as it makes for easier reading.

    We have done so

  - A recruitment subheading is needed

    We have included
How did you recruit the participants - did you contact them directly, speak with family members, obtained the names from birth lists, word of mouth? Use snowball techniques?

We have provided explanation under sampling and recruitment

Usually case studies draw on multiple data sources - common sources, including direct and indirect observations, field notes, documents, physical artefacts. Did you also collect any of these? If not just an explanation why you only used the focus groups?

-It was a normal qualitative study and not a case study, and we have provided clarification for this

Did you do any one to one interview. 10 participants per focus group is quite large. A comment about the impact of this on data quality and how the groups worked together would be useful - this potentially is a bias.

-We have explained the bias in the limitations

Data collection: an example of the some of the questions used -and include the topic guide as supplementary material.

We have provided a summary of the questions in the methods section

I assume the follow up questions where used as prompts?

yes

Where the focus groups conducted in the participants house, community area, clinic? In common spaces, we have provided more explanation

Time frame for recruitment?

In February and march of 2016, we have provided explanation for this
How did you identify the participants? Where they self-selecting? Did you have an inclusion and exclusion criteria?

- It was via purposesive and convenient sampling, we have provided the reason for this and also cited it as limitation in the limitation section.

Analysis

What analysis approach / what guided your analysis and procedure? see Yin R K. 2014 Case study research: Design and method. (5th Ed) Thousand Oaks. CA Sage. For example, did you do:

- Holistic - entire case, who undertook the analysis?
- Embedded - specific aspect of the case

We relied on social representation theory to analyze the data via thematic analysis. An approach which is common in qualitative studies.

Can you discuss how the social representation framework was used to guide your analysis the data? for example was it used to inform predefined codes/ coding framework? or your reflections about the case?

The analysis in this study followed dictates of social representation theory. In this regard, similar opinions from participants were grouped together in NVivo to form various clusters of basic themes which later give rise to global theme.

Perhaps combine this section together as it would read more like a case study approach then:

- It is a qualitative study and we followed the standard structure required by BMC.

It is common to use a narrative description in case studies- tell a story : integrating the direct quotes with indirect - paraphrasing and drawing from your observations and the literature to make it more of a narrative description of the case and context.
An issue description is common - drawing form the data sources with your interpretations

Followed by the presentation of the overall case claims

Reflective process: What was your reflective process - as this is very important for case study research? A sub heading about this and limitations strengths would be appropriate

Thank you for the suggestion, however our study was a normal qualitative study and we followed standard processes of presenting one.

A closing vignette provides the reader with a final experience. It is a way of bringing context in and reminding the reader that this is one group of peoples encounters of a complex case.

Finally, it would appear that perhaps what you have done is an intrinsic case study- in which the focus is on the case itself TBA - Skilled care? (e.g. evaluating a program)?

You need to remember that this focus is on the narrative- and offer a detailed description of the case, set within the context and surroundings.

If not - then perhaps call this a qualitative study and not a case study as the way it is presented supports, the former.

Yes, it is a qualitative study and not a case study and we have corrected this.

Tables

Please review the presentation of these. For example, age can be categorised into groups or a mean with a standard deviation.

Combining with suggestions from other reviewers, we have rewritten the age section.

Remove the ID

was this study funded? any conflicts of interest
No, and the details are provided in the standard fill-up steps on our BMC profile attached to this article. And at the end in the declaration section.

good luck

this paper is worthy of publication after major revisions

Thank you very much for your review