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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

Thanks for your comments

I tried to address all the comments point by point, the revised parts are highlighted as a green background in the text.

Kind regards
Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: The part « This qualitative study was done as content analysis. Qualitative studies are based on the naturalistic paradigm, in which the uniqueness of phenomena is supported (15). The findings of a qualitative study are consequences of human experiences, and indeed it is emerged from interaction between researcher and participants” is useless.

Response: this part was added in response to the reviewers in the first round of review that noted” For a better understanding, the methods section should begin with a description of the type of the study”. I wrote them in subcategory of type of study.

This part could be changed by the first sentence of the "participants" section: "The present qualitative study was conducted in 2017 with the aim of explaining the views of primiparous women on the type of delivery. Data collection lasted about three month from June to August 2017” which coincide more with the type of the study.

Response: it was moved

The limitations of the study could not be considered as real limitations. In the same way, having a good relationship between the researcher and participants could not be considered as a study's strength.

Response: we tried to rephrase the sentences and some of them were removed