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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers

Reviewer #3:

You have nicely covered various issues surrounding midwifery practice and its implications in humanitarian settings within the broader context of international standards.

Thank you for your positive feedback

I would also suggest you to look at the congruence of national guidelines and scope of their work and how it matches with the international guidelines and minimum service package to affect the practice in the real life situation.

Thank you for this suggestion. However, this is beyond the scope of our paper, as we set out to include analysis of international guidance. Including an analysis of national guidelines would considerably lengthen the paper, as additional information from the national guidelines of 12 countries would have to be included.

It is interesting to get to know about the range of issues surfaced in the study which will really be important for the policy makers to know and respond to in their context.

Thank you for the positive feedback.

At the time of reading the findings, I felt a bit confused and went back to the title and introduction of the manuscript to know what key issues this manuscript intends to deal with, which are role and scope of the midwife in humanitarian setting. I would prefer to rearrange the findings into most prominent roles emerging from the review and content analysis.
We clearly state (lines 194-197) that we have used the disaster /emergency management framework to organise the findings – we believe this is the most useful way to present the findings as it has highlighted that there are more gaps in the guidance and the evidence related to ‘mitigation and preparedness’ and ‘recovery’ phases compared to the ‘response’ phase. We think this structure will be helpful to international and national policymakers, researchers, and educators.

On collaboration, I would prefer to identify major areas of collaboration and conflicts with co-workers. Later in the discussion section, it would be great to discuss the key emergent areas in the light of international standards and guidelines.

We have summarised the main issues in the discussion (lines 393-399).

From the readers' perspectives, I would say to clearly identify the gaps in the practice and highlight it in the box.

We have highlighted the gaps in Table 5 with ‘X’ and have added text to the discussion (p19, lines 369-73, and to the conclusion (p23 lines 456-7).

Also it will be useful to club together the issues and challenges in collaborations.

The issues and challenges related to collaboration are all under one subheading (p17 lines 324-362) so we are not clear what is being asked for here.

You have done a great job and I feel rearranging the text and reducing the size of the manuscript to keep it concise will be useful.

We disagree with rearranging the text for the reasons provided above. We have already shortened the paper considerably on the advice of the previous two reviewers and do not feel we can reduce it further without losing essential content.