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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thank you for your comments. Sure, they are fundamental to enable our paper for a possible publication.

We agree the manuscript needs comprehensive English review. The language was widely reviewed by a fluent person, as required by.

The answer to each of the suggestions of reviewers is highlight in yellow.

We are willing to make any changes that may still be necessary.

Kind regards,

The authors

REVIEWER REPORTS
REVIEWER #1: Language needs to be corrected

It is not very clear, are the patient getting free treatment getting more abused or vice versa

There are several repetitions in the paper

Response: the text was modified in several parts, as highlighted. We hope this review has clarify the confused points and eliminated the repetitions. The language was widely reviewed by a fluent person.

REVIEWER #2: Overall the subject is of immense interest to researchers in the related fields of violence against women and Safe Motherhood. While the manuscript highlights a few pertinent issues, I have a few comments and suggestions.

Background: This section will benefit from an extensive international literature review to highlight what specifically needs additional research that this manuscript is contributing to. For example, on Page 6, lines 15 - 28, simply mentions that 'large numbers of women are victims of this type of violence' ... but does not address the more pertinent issues of the prevalence and in particular the 'factors' associated with disrespect and abuse during childbirth.

Response: the text was modified, and some references were included to meet the request. However, details on associations describe in the literature are mentioned in the discussion. Therefore, to avoid repetitions we opted to keep detailed information only in the discussion section.

Methods: The methods section is well described and informative. However, it will be helpful if the authors discuss their rationale for opting for poisson regression rather than other multivariate analytic approaches. In addition, potential socio-demographic risk factors, age, skin color, marital status, education and income, were included in the first level analyses. What was the rationale - a more extensive literature review as suggested will address. Furthermore, the authors mention (Page 9, lines 5-6) 'a priori decision to retain family income and women' age" - will be helpful if the authors their rationale for inclusion in all models used to building the hierarchical causal model.

Response: we included in the text the reasons to using poisson regression and to keeping income and age of women for adjustment.

Results:

Page 10, lines 13 - 18): please review text and include the relevant table.

Response: the relevant table was included.
Page 10 (line 37): 'linked to universities' - data not shown. How many university teaching hospitals are located in Pelotas? Please review the entire para (page 10, lines 34-45) for clarity - it is confusing to the reader with no data associated to reflect on.

Response: the results for type of hospitals was removed from paper. The results, the way they were, were confused and the space is limited to explain in details the payment system of hospitals in Brazil. Further, these results are not fundamental to meet the objective of this study.

Please review the results section critically, to assess whether the results shed light (with data findings) on the objectives and does add to the global body of evidence on disrespect and abuse of women during childbirth.

Response: we revised the text and we did some modifications to clarify how our results contribute to the global evidence. Our study is one of the few based-population on the question. Further, the sample size is very large, which give statistical power to evaluate associations. It is very important to conduct studies all around the world to show the global magnitude of the problem and to identify vulnerable groups, who can to vary in different places.

Please review the tables numbering and content - does not align with the text.

Response: the tables numbering, and content were reviewed ant corrected.

Discussion:

Page 10 (line 52 - 58): Please review the numbers carefully to avoid 'double counting'.

Response: the number was reviewed, and the text was modified.

Page 11(lines 14 - 26): Please review for clarity. For example, what are the authors stating and how does the text relate to the results described either in the text in the results section or in the tables.

Response: the text was modified to attend the request.

Page 11 (lines 30 - 55): suggest including relevant text in the background as a rationale for relating to one of the objective/prevalence of the manuscript.

Response: the text was modified to attend the request.

Page 12(lines 1 - 10): data not shown either in tables or text. Please include or delete as appropriate

Response: the results for type of hospitals was removed from paper.

Page 12 (lines 12 - 35): Please review text for clarity.
Response: the text was modified to attend the request.