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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript was a pleasure to read as well as proving original research in an area of expanding interest.

The storyline flows extremely well but what I would like to see is a little more information about the methods/methodology. This is extremely brief. For example qualitative research underpinned by feminist theory covers a huge range and I would like a paragraph or two on more detail. How were the themes derived? What made this study feminist? How could you be sure that the women had no medication during labour? Were all the participants local, or national? With Fb recruitment they could come from anywhere. Other fine detail such as this would enhance the rigour of the study. Also the order...you have the ethical approval after you talk about data analysis, surely it should be further up. I am also uncertain about the inclusion of the theme of "encapsulation". I have no doubt about its derivation from your data but is it relevant? I don't think so....but you could persuade me otherwise. Finally I wonder if you have too much description in the findings leaving too little room for the discussion? My feeling was that the findings could have done with a little more in-depth discussion.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
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