Reviewer’s report

Title: Quality of care during childbirth in Tanzania: identification of areas that need improvement

Version: 0 Date: 17 Dec 2017

Reviewer: Ana Franzon

Reviewer’s report:

REPH-D-17-00338

Quality of care during childbirth in Tanzania: identification of areas that need improvement

Research article

Abstract

Abstract clearly states the goals and relevance of the research in promoting safer maternal and reproductive health care. It may be helpful if authors briefly state if by the "active management of the third stage of labour" they mean the one defined by the World Health Organization or other. Methods chosen are accordingly to the aim of better understand the status of quality of care as a strategy to address remaining barriers. An important article for health settings in middle and low-income countries.

Key Words

According to the abstract, authors focus on the two interventions (partograph and active management of the third stage) but only Partograph is shown as a key word. Why?

Introduction

Page 5, lines 100-101: Authors justify there's little research about the quality of care of both interventions focused on the present analysis, but lack to refer to any published studies.

Lines 101-102: Qualitative research examines more how care process are conducted, and less what services are offered. It might be useful for authors to justify a little longer the relevance of performing a qualitative design.

Methods

Setting and Observations sections are very well written and described.
On Setting, I only wonder if there's a lack of information about if there were basic or Comprehensive EmOC specifically on the observed settings (although it is clear how it is disposed among the health system facilities).

Observations section brings a brilliant statement on the researcher personal and professional enrollment with the studied scenario. Therefore, I kindly suggest authors to consider renaming the section to communicate these aspects both of Observer and Observations. Also, I wonder if researcher could declare oneself as technically and academically engaged in the defense of the best practices in obstetric care, in order to prevent potential bias.

Recruitment strategy is satisfactorily described according to the aim of the research. It is also clear how data was collected and analyzed.

Data collection - check punctuation on page 7, lines 163-164.

Results

Very detailed and enriched results. Although I find the piece fully satisfactory in terms of in-depth description, cleanness of how the themes were organized from the data and sufficient data reporting; there remains a perspective, as a reviewer (and here I quote CASP) "Whether the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation". As previously noticed on "Methods - Observations", this would address the clarification if the researcher is engaged in the study as an observer compromised with a theoretical and technical framework and which one it would be.

Discussion & Conclusions

Again, the theme of researcher's role in critically observing maternal health care is presented. Then, my suggestion becomes the one to reunite this information that is presented sparsely through the manuscript in a strong and solid position statement at early pages. To reference the Standards of care and quality statements (WHO, 2016) seems fair enough.

A specific discussion over quality of maternity care and maternal death and morbidity reduction could strengthen analysis for the multiple and complex components of quality of care? In addition to strengthened health systems, promoting quality of care is also related to the implementation and assurance of a human rights approach to maternal health. (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjog.2005.11.004)

Lines 491-493: In authors opinion, what could promote nurses to perceive their ability to provide meaningful care to women in the first stage of labour?

Congrats! It's a great article.
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