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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for the opportunity to review the manuscript.

In the background section starting line 67. Please review the whole section about maternal mortality as the authors are mixing data sources and quite confusing for the reader. Please also note that the target of MMR of 70 is a global target and not necessarily a national target.

On line 98 it reads; framework for maternal and child health suppose the focus is maternal health.

Line 116, please add reference to the preliminary study.

Line 121, "…we ask expert to articulate their new collective meaning….". Please elaborate as not clear.

Please indicate how the key informant were selected.

Attached the interview guide as an annex.

Line 165 it reads: "we conducted an expert mapping…." Which expert and how was the mapping done?

Line 173 it reads; about 19 experts were contacted. How many were contacted?

Line 175 it reads; face to face and telephone interviews. Please discus biases using different interview methods.

Line 199 it reads; "we used a transparent and systematic approach…” please describe the approach.

Line 207 and in the parts of the manuscript it reads; that the finding can be used in other LMIC settings. Please justify this statement.

How was the coding done? How many authors took part in coding and analysis?

Line 492 it reads; "similar studies can be conducted in……." please justify this statement.
Line 501 it reads; "……. part of an on-going project……" which project?

Line 518 it reads, " we recommend similar studies in other LMIC…….." on which basis?

Please discuss strengths and limitations of the study.
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