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17th April 2019

Maggie Redshaw
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth

Dear Dr Redshaw,

Thank you for sending us the reviewers’ comments for MS PRCH-D-18-00698R1 - Patient Reported Outcome Measures for use in Pregnancy and Childbirth: A Systematic Review.

We found the reviewers’ comments helpful and have addressed each of the comments as set out below. We hope the revised manuscript can now be considered for publication.

We look forward to response.

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Dickinson
and

Professor Nynke van den Broek
on behalf of all authors
Technical comments:

- **Abbreviations:**
  This section has been moved to follow the Conclusion and precede the Declarations.

Dominique Constance McKenzie Mylod (Reviewer 3):
Thank you for your helpful comments, they have been addressed in the following ways:

- p.9 line 25 'a PROMs' (this is not intended to be plural?)
  This has been corrected – ‘s’ removed.

- p. 12 line 45 'it's' (this should be the possessive pronoun 'its')
  This has been corrected – apostrophe has been removed.

- **PROMs versus PREMs**
  Whilst PROMs specifically assess health outcomes and PREMs, patient experience, it is anticipated that the psychological aspects of health addressed by a purposefully designed PROM could also detect outcomes relating to women’s experiences of care, particularly relating to adverse care experiences.

- **Cultural, linguistic and administration challenges**
  Additional sentences have been added to the Discussion section to address these challenges.

- Your systematic review has demonstrated that available PROMs are haphazard and of limited use in specific circumstances in maternity care. It would be helpful to have a stronger case made for a Maternal Wellbeing PROM and consideration given towards its development and implementation.
  Thank you. We agree with this and have formulated this recommendation in our conclusion section.

Danielle Groleau (Reviewer 4):
Thank you for your helpful comments, they have been addressed in the following ways:

- 6 line 38: typo or word missing after impact..« Fletcher's study assessed interventions to reduce the impact hyperemesis gravidarum by means of a randomised controlled trial »
  This has been corrected by insertion of the word ‘of’.

- **Discussion section:** Linking to the statement in the introduction on the efforts to improve the quality of maternity health care in low resource settings, a few sentences in the discussion section could address the following issues:
  a. the issue of the transcultural validity of the PROMs reviewed and/or future PROMs to be developed.
  b. the need for future PROMS to be developed to be applicable in various countries and cultural settings as well as various health care settings such as hospital, maternity clinics, primary care.
  An additional paragraph has been added to the discussion section detailing the potentially limited applicability of the identified studies and the need for future PROMs to be developed and validated with a broader target audience in mind, including LMICs. The identified studies do incorporate a variety of settings (hospital, clinic, home) but future PROMs would also need to ensure that these are included in the development and validation stages.