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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors are correct that many studies don't focus on the perceptions or expectations of mothers birthing the placenta. This study serves to fill this gap while focusing on mothers experiences.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Table 1 is described as demographics of the participant sample but none of the expected demographics were used...e.g. age, race, ethnicity etc. If these factors were unable to be used due to confidentiality reasons then the table shouldn't be referred to as "demographic". Also it may be better to group the patients based on factors presented. For example structuring the table to allow the rows to show the distribution of the characteristics - Parity, type of management etc. So for Type of management Active = 8 (40%) and Expectant = 11 (55%) and unsure= 1 (5%). This would allow you to then describe the characteristics by saying the majority of the women had Expectant management. This table appears to be intended to be shown in the methods section (assumption based on [insert table 1] seen in Methods section. This table belongs in the results/findings section.

The authors indicated that they intended to recruit 20 mothers and would recruit more if saturation was not met. The authors did not define saturation or indicate what led them to believe saturation was met with the initial 20 subjects.

In the Findings section, the authors use the word "many", "some" etc. These words are subjective and given the fact that the authors have supporting information, I recommend that they use quantification as supporting evidence for the arguments made. For example, is "some" 2/20 cases or is it 9/20 cases? The findings section has a lot of information to sort through. It would have been helpful if the themes and takeaways were organized into tables. For example the main takeaways are discussed in the discussion section. But it would have been helpful to see the claims made in the discussion supported with table(s) in the findings/results section. For example, "...in this study most women reported that their care providers did not discuss the risks and benefits of active versus expectant management with them". A table showing the number of women who had and did not have risk/benefits explained would have been helpful. This would allow the reader/audience to be able to interpret the study for themselves and review the conclusions to determine if they agree/disagree with the author.
Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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