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Reviewer's report:

The article presents a topic of great interest in the Spanish context of healthcare delivery. I appreciate the opportunity to review that article; but some aspects should be expanded or clarified. This would, certainly, improve the quality of work.

Major concerns

1. Background

More information on the worldwide cesarean deliveries rate should be added, as well as the recommendations on this rate of WHO and the Spanish quality standards related.

2. Methods

* Settings

It would be highly interesting to include not only the type of hospital where professionals work, but also the cesarean rate of each hospital.

* Sample

Even though in "Background" section it is said that 20 hospitals were included in the program, only 28 professionals were interviewed. How may it be possible if in section "Sample" it is explained that "two professionals in each centre were interviewed"?

This kind of information must be carefully exposed.

* The description of the sample in Table 3

Only sex and type of hospital are gathered as main characteristics of the professionals interviewed. However, age, nationality, year in which they finished their studies as midwives or in Obstetrics and Gynecology, working professional experience, previous training on
humanization of delivery or during their job in hospitals (if this training was autonomous or professionally guided), etc.

3. Ethics approval and consent to participate
Authors must specify that confidentiality of information is maintained at all times.

4. Methods_ Information gathering procedure
It is not fully explained that interviewers are not the researchers. This must be clearly stated.

5. Table 4 and 5
These tables have not been quoted in the main manuscript, when they have been described in "Results" section.

6. Results
If the program NVivo has been used to analyze the results, then several images to illustrate better the relationship between the results may had been included.

7. Discussion
In the "Discussion" section, it is necessary to compare the results with those of other studies. For example, there are studies which have compared midwives models with biomedical models, and others where authors describe facilitators and barriers in the humanization of childbirth practices.

In addition to this, strengths and limitations of the study must be discussed in this section. There must also appear a reflection of the influence of the researcher on the data.

Minor concerns
1. Methods
An explanation of the initials "PAC" should always be presented when used for the first time, and not in "Discussion" section.
2. Table 4

The word "Factors" should appear in the gray headings: "Factors related to …"

3. Results:

* Section "Factors related to professional practice"

This title does not appear at all in table 5 and it is supposed to be describing it somehow. The only similar title found in this table is "at the professional and individual level".

* Items titles

If your results are based on the dimensions of Table 1, then in "Results" section and in tables should appear the same dimensions and avoid varying the name of the items, e.g. "Factors related to the motivation and attitudes of healthcare professionals" (Table 1), "At the professional and individual level" (Table 5), "Factors related to professional practice" (p11, line 402). There must be coherence in the use of terms and titles given to items along the whole article.
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