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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper on this important issue. please find my comments below:

Abstract

Needs some work - a bit repetitive and needs review of language use. I am not sure one can say 'never before' regarding observations of labour and delivery being conducted.

Background -

Quite long - could be reduced

Line 80  factor used twice in same sentence

Line 88- detailed description of Bowser and Hill not required - sufficient to say which manifestations they identified - reference required.

Methods

A huge amount of detail here - probably not all required. The detail regarding the process of getting permission to conduct the study is too long. I suggest it is sufficient to state that approval for research was given by...... and all facility staff were informed regarding the research. I don't think we need to know which author did what. Suggest separate headings for analysis process - perhaps a little more detail there. Is there any protocol number for the ethical review? In other studies the issue regarding when the observer might need to step in to ensure patient safety - normally this is discussed with the MOH or other clinical experts in country and agreed on before commencing the study.

Line 192 - what is "disconfirming"
The analysis process description is a little confusing.

Results

Encourage mother-baby relationships - yes but it is also a WHO standard that all baby's breastfeed within the first hour as part of essential newborn care. p17 line 249 - also seems to be in the wrong place regarding the flow - going from breastfeeding back to labour- suggest moving it to the end of that section - before the disrespect section (end of p18)

Comment: line 320 onwards - this is very worrying! using a broken ampule to rupture membranes!

While the quotes are all very interesting they are quite long - it would be good to see where they can be reduced somewhat.

Discussion

I do not think the lack of accountability is a 'completely new category" this has been described elsewhere - line 548. see references below from the Kenya study on D&A. Rather than saying it is new - consider saying how it is building the broader picture in Tanzania and globally or the extent of the problem. Accountability is discussed in Freedman et al.

See Ndwiga C et al Exploring provider perspectives on respectful maternity care in Kenya: "Work with what you have" 2017

Warren Ce et al "Manifestations and drivers of mistreatment of women during childbirth in Kenya: implications for measurement and developing interventions" 2017

Warren CE "Sowing the seeds of transformative practice to actualize women's rights to respectful maternity care: reflections from Kenya using the consolidated framework for implementation research" 2017

Limitations and implications sections are quite long and repetitive consider reducing the length. The Hawthorne effect as to whether the providers change their behaviour is worth mentioning but not in detail - it is clearly obvious from the results that their behaviour was definitely lacking even when they knew they were being observed.
implications - again repetitive - is it possible to consider how facilities might be supported to make changes instead of just saying providers 'should' be trained equipment 'should' be made available etc. There have been a number of studies done on D&A in Tanzania now - are you just repeating the same things? perhaps it would be worth suggesting how researchers, programmers and MOH could come together to strategise how to improve the situation?

General comments

Needs copy editing by native English speaker overall it is good but could be more succinct/shorter

Suggest using D&A rather than D & A or even spelling it out each time. I am not sure of the journal's guidelines but generally % would be written in full "20 percent" and % only used in parenthesis (20%)
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