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Reviewer’s report

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) The manuscript has many grammatical errors and the authors need to extensively edit the manuscript before it is accepted for publication.

Background

1) The authors should briefly describe the policy environment related to MNH in Bangladesh (i.e., are there any national level policy documents that provide strategic direction and guide the implementation of programmatic initiatives on MNH? Do the documents outline the priority areas or gaps related to MNH?)

Methods

1) Lines 1-5: Authors need to clearly describe which of the health facilities (MCWCs or UHCs) are sub-district hospitals.

2) Line 2-3: Revise “…are the primary health centres and the first point of referral.” “…serves a population of between 200,000 and 400,000 and a bed capacity of between 31 and 50.”

3) Delete Line 5

4) Was the structured interview tool translated into local languages used by the respondents?

5) Line 6: Insert Table 1 between “Quantitative methods” and “Ethical issues”

Qualitative methods

1) Although Table 1 shows the cadres of staff interviewed for FGDs and IDIs, the authors should briefly discuss the category of staff interviewed by each interview technique.

2) How long were the data collectors trained?
Quantitative methods
1) For quality of care assessment, did the authors have a framework that guided tool development and data analysis? For example, Donabedian framework of healthcare quality (comprising structure, process and outcomes).
2) Was the structured interview tool translated into local languages used by the respondents?
3) Was the questionnaire subjected to validity and reliability tests?

Ethical Issues
1) With regard to confidentiality, the authors should provide a description of how data were stored and who had access to the data
2) How was the study participants assured of their privacy and confidentiality of information given? Were they advised that their participation was voluntary?

Results
Quantitative
1) Lines 11-13: Revise sentence to read: The average mean waiting time before being seen by a health provider was 10.95 minutes, 9.67 minutes and 14.79 minutes at the district hospitals, MCWCs and UHCs, respectively.
2) Table 2: What was the average age of the participants who participated in the exit interviews? Authors need to present results on other socio-demographic factors such as education level, marital status, parity level.
3) Table 3: Provide the total N for the percentages presented
4) Table 3: Were the differences between the type of hospitals and quality of care domains statistically significant? Show the p values for the results presented in the table.
5) Table 3: Domain on “Satisfied with MNH services received” – What were the specific services? Was there variation in satisfaction levels across the specific services? How was satisfaction measured – i.e., Likert-type scale or yes/no?

Discussion
1) Overall, this section should be organized (paragraph by paragraph) based on key themes as discussed in the results section
2) Another limitation of the study is that quality of care was assessed at the outcome level only (client perspective) and not at the structure and process levels

Conclusion
1) What are the key messages? How can the evidence inform policy and practice to improve quality of care of MNH services in Bangladesh?
2) Line 3: “Further actions are needed to …” State the actions that can be taken.

Minor Essential Revisions
Abstract
1) Line 5: Add the word “are” after rates… and replace the word “compare” with “comparison”
2) Line 9: Replace the word “on” with “with” and remove “they”. Use “sub-district” instead “below”
3) Line 14: Revise the sentence to read…Client exit interviews were conducted with 112 patients of the attendants from maternity…
4) Line 15: Replace the words “…were interviewed during their exit from the hospital” with “before being discharged from the hospital”
5) Line 19: Replace “manpower” with “staff”
6) Line 26: Replace “diseases” with “health conditions”
7) Conclusion: Line 1: Replace “…below” with “sub-district” level hospitals…”

Background
1) Line 12: “…occur” should be “occurred”
2) Line 15: add “s” to maternal death
3) Line 16: Use “key” instead of “significant” and add “s” to “achievement”
4) Line 18: Remove “has” after MMR and create spacing between “322to…”
5) Line 19: Remove “has” after NMR and create spacing between “52to…”
6) Line 21: Revise the sentence to read “… to achieve MDGs 4 and 5”
7) Line 24: …replace “the” with “a” major contributing factor…
8) Line 4: Rephrase sentence “These inadequacies place patients and fetuses at risk.” Suggestion: “The weak health systems place women and babies at risk for morbidity and mortality”
9) Lines 4-6: Cite the reference for the statement beginning with “Similar inadequacies could also…”
10) Line 10: Remove the comma after the word “care”
11) Line 11: Delete the words “For an initial understanding…” Instead the sentence should begin with: “This study was conducted to…”
12) Lines 13 & 14: Second part of sentence should be revised to “…patients satisfaction with the MNH care received from district and sub-district level hospitals in Bangladesh.”

METHODS
1) Lines 17-20: Revise to read “…Mixed method approaches (both qualitative and quantitative) were adopted to collect data between November and December 2011. Specifically, focus group discussions (FGDs) with xxxxx and in-depth interviews (IDIs) with xxxxx to explore health care providers’ perception on the quality of care. Client exit interviews were conducted with patients and their attendants to assess their satisfaction with care received at the facility.

2) Lines 21-24: Revise sentence – Fourteen government hospitals in Thakurgaon and Jamalpur districts were purposively selected as the study settings based on
assessment of progress towards achievement of MDGs 4 and 5. Thakurgaon was selected for high performance and Jamalpur for low performance. Authors need to cite the source of evidence used to assess performance of the districts.

Qualitative methods
1) This section needs major edits to correct the grammatical errors. The authors should abbreviate focus group discussions as “FGDs” and not “GD”

Results
Qualitative
1) Line 15: Instead of “Qualitative part” revise to “Qualitative results”
2) Lines 17-25: The paragraph needs to be removed. Instead the authors should state how the results will be structured or presented – See Lines 2-5.
3) The IDI results should be incorporated within the key themes instead of being presented separately – see lines 17-25 & Lines 1-19.
4) The interview quotes should be indented. Also, at the end of each quote, state if it is an IDI or FGD, category of staff interview, place (district).

Quantitative
1) Line 21: Instead of “Quantitative part” revise to “Quantitative results”
2) Line 24-25: Delete sentence beginning with “Eight exit interviews from each hospital were conducted.” – This is repetition.
3) Lines 1-4: Move this paragraph to the methods section under “Quantitative”

Discussion
1) Restate the study objective before discussing the key findings
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Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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