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Author’s response to reviews:

Comments: However, the Discussion is difficult to be followed. I sent you some instructions about a better organization of the discussion, that of course you are free to follow or not. Regardless your decision not to follow this advice, the discussion needs much work. The first paragraph is focused on the limitations of the study and in general the strengths and the limitations should come after the interpretation of the results to give a view of the limitations of the interpretations. It is not easy to the reader of the article to have a good view of the principal findings of your study. Inclusive in the Conclusions of your study you wrote: “This study has identified the shortcomings of MDAs with respect to their programming, communication during planification, implementation, and the compliance with the basic principles and rules when conducting maternal death reviews”. But you did not mention which are such shortcomings, again without providing the reader a clear message to take home about the main message of your study.

In sum, I am asking you if you can make a better structure of the Discussion section and to significantly shorten it as much as you can to facilitate the interpretation of the study.
Response: we thank the reviewer for the relevant comments.

We revised the discussions according to these comments. We make a better structure of the discussion and we discuss each section of the results.