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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for this interesting and novel systematic review. You have revised the manuscript substantially on the basis of previous recommendations; however, may I draw your attention to the following typographical errors:

p.9 line 25 'a PROMs' (this is not intended to be plural?)
p. 12 line 45 'it's' (this should be the possessive pronoun 'its').

You differentiate between PROMs and PREMs in terms of evaluating physical and psychosocial wellbeing with the former and women's experience with the latter. However, is it wise to separate these aspects? For example, there is ample evidence that the experience and subsequent health and wellbeing of women with complications in pregnancy and childbirth are significantly influenced by their relationship with their maternity carers. It might be more productive. Although in your manuscript you state that more women in developing nations are likely to give birth in maternity units, the issue of cultural, linguistic and administration challenges is not considered in your conclusion, even though most PROMs appear to be developed in high income, ethically White predominant maternity settings. For example, a previous BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth systematic review (Shrestha et al. 2016) concluded that the EPND scale could lacked validity and reliability outside of the UK.

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.

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

Yes

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

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

Unable to assess

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
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Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.