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Reviewer's report:

P.2 line 65. Caesarean section (CS) is a life-saving surgical intervention performed when complications occur during pregnancy and/or labour and is the most common major operation worldwide.
Needs reference

p. 3 line 76. Sepsis reduction, SSIs reduction and reducing antibiotic use have been identified as national and international priorities.
Needs reference

P. 3, line 84. Therefore, in addition to examining women's priorities in relation to CS recovery and infection prevention…
There is insufficient materials to lead up to this sentence.
P.5, line 162. Four participants reported experiences of infection; two related to wound haematomas, one had endometritis and one superficial wound infection.
Should it be ":" rather than ";" for clarity?

P.5. Table 1. The presentation is not clear. I would suggest reformatting to something like:
Sample (N) 21
Age (years) Range 26-45
    Mean 34.4
Marital status Married 15
    Partner 5
    No response 1
Ethnicity White British 16
    British Asian 1
    Mixed race British 2
    White American 1
    African Asian 1
Employment Yes 18
    No 2
    No response 1
Contracted employment hours Full time 11
    Part time 8
    Unemployed 2
No. of children Range 1-4
Mean 1.9
First CS Yes 12
   No 9
No of CS in the past  None 12
   1-3 9
Type of CS  Elective 12
   Emergency 9
Experience of infection after last CS Yes 4
   No 17

P.5, table 1. In employment you have 18 yes, but contracted employment hours you have 11 working full time and 8 working part time, that is 19.

P.7 line 233. A minority of participants (n=4)… Can we say 4 out of 21 be minority?

P.8, line 304. One women felt that she was not given adequate information about CS recovery and infection because her health team 'judged' her for having an elective CS delivery. There is one women mentioned judged. In that section, there was no elaboration, not quote or anything about that. That does not seem making strong enough argument.

P.11 line 440. Women reported feeling that they must 'justify' the need for their CS delivery and must 'keep up' with the recovery pace of peers who have had vaginal deliveries. There was only one place in the manuscript talked about being judged (P.8 line 305). Other than that, there is not enough suggestions or evidence that is the case.
P.11 line 442 Additionally, some believed that health practitioners' judgement influenced why they received little to no information regarding CS recovery and infection prevention during. Inadequate discussion about health care providers judged them. Only one line in discussion mentioned about this topic (P.8 line 305).
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