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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor, (Subject: Submission of revised research article)I am writing to you to submit the revised manuscript titled “Development of a targeted client communication intervention to women using an electronic maternal and child health registry: a qualitative study”. We have addressed the issues raised by reviewers for the first version of our manuscript, and indicated the changes we made using track changes. We included point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments below. Best regards, J. Frederik Frøen, MD, PhDGlobal Health Cluster, Division for Health Services, Norwegian Institute of Public Health+47 21 07 81 94 (Office), +47 92 49 34 35 (Mobile)E mail: frederik.froen@fhi.noResponses to the reviewers’ commentsManuscript Code: MIDM-D-19-00278Title: Development of a targeted client communication intervention to women
using an electronic maternal and child health registry: a qualitative study

Andrew Georgiou

Reviewer 1: Abstract: The Abstract makes a statement that the effectiveness of the TCC intervention is assessed in a cluster-randomized trial (ISRCTN10520687). I assume this is a separate study. This is not clear from the Abstract. Our response: Thank you for identifying this. We have removed the sentence from the abstract and conclusion, and rephrased it into the background section to clarify that this paper only describes the planning, development, and evaluation of the TCC intervention – there is no effectiveness analyses in this manuscript.

Introduction: Line 84 suggests that TCC interventions via SMS are under-theorised, poorly specified and vaguely described. This seems like an important statement but it is not very well supported. Why is a theory-driven approach required? Consider providing more of an explanation of the connection between theory, specification and description. This would help develop the argument better. Our response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have added explanations and support to the statement with more references. Please, see line 89-93.

Methods: Can the authors provide more information about their sample? During the findings, there were comments about education levels and other factors, which were not reported as part of the purposive sampling, and were not described adequately. Our response: We have added more information about the sampling procedure of pregnant women. Please see line 152/153. We also added a paragraph describing the background characteristics of the women in result section. Please, see line 196-199.

Results: The results section summarises findings from the interviews along with reports about the composition and evaluation of text messages and the technology platform. There are a lot of steps involved here which do not get adequately described. It is hard to judge the validity, reproducibility and comprehensiveness of these findings. The authors need to find a way to present these points with more details and in a much more transparent manner. Our response: Thank you for this valuable comment. We have now clarified how all the steps relate to each other, please see line 283-293. We added a column in Table 2 (please see line 340) indicating the source of information to describe how the different components of results come in congruence in the intervention development. We also added summary of the results from “Part I” in line 274 through 281 and how the main results were applied in the next steps (please see line 321-324). Along with the additional files and supportive tables and figures, we believe we now provide comprehensive information about this TCC intervention development.

Discussion: The Discussion needs to provide a more comprehensive overview of how the findings from this study compare to similar studies along with those of related areas of research. Our response: We discussed our findings with other studies by adding references to it. Please see line 375-380. The Discussion does not provide a very good explanation of how the study was theory-driven. The paper needs to provide a good appreciation of what theory is being used or developed. It also should reflect on how the theory related to the findings and the implications of the paper. Our response: We have revised and added more content into the paragraph that explains the theories and its implications (line 390-399). How we applied constructs of the models in our research is also included in Fig 1, Table 2, and Table 3 (files attached separately).

Pouyan Esmaeil Zadeh, PhD (Reviewer 2): The authors takes a qualitative methodology to show the effectiveness of Targeted client communication (TCC) intervention to women using electronic maternal and child health registry. They collected data through interviews with 18 pregnant women and 8 with healthcare providers. They use thematic analyses to extract themes from the interview data. There is something I confused here that they analyzed all data using software or based on traditional manual procedures usually used in qualitative research? Our response: Please see our response to Reviewer 1’s first question regarding a cluster-randomized controlled effectiveness trial. We hope this misunderstanding has been clarified. For the second