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Reviewer's report:

Comments

GENERAL OVERALL COMMENTS:

* It was a pleasure reading this manuscript on a very important and under-researched topic

* Strong use of current evidence (Lancet series articles 2011 & 2016)

* Well designed study with rigorous evaluation methods

* Clearly written with the purpose of the research well identified. The importance of the need for interventions targeting physical and mental wellbeing for women who have experienced stillbirth was clearly highlighted.

* The term 'post-traumatic stress' is used throughout the paper yet in the study protocol (reference 25) 'post-traumatic stress disorder' was used and abbreviated to PTSD. It is not clear why the authors switched from using the term PTSD to using post-traumatic stress? Please clarify.

* The study protocol clarifies why yoga in particular may be a suitable intervention to improve both the emotional and physical well being of women who have experienced stillbirth however this is not explained in the current manuscript. It would be beneficial to have one sentence linking yoga to improved emotional and physical well being in the perinatal population.

BACKGROUND

The following revisions are recommended:

Lines 10-12:
Please consider rewording the following sentence: "These risks may persist years after the baby's death, with one-third of grieving mothers demonstrating clinical levels of post-traumatic stress at 18 years since after loss".

Lines 23-25:

When reading this sentence, it appears slightly awkward. Perhaps delete the word 'are' before the word reluctant: "Many mothers express a strong interest in home-based treatments as they do not want to encounter other babies in public and support groups are not effective for post-traumatic stress or women reluctant to communicate with others".

Lines 26-27:

For the phrase many are interested in conceiving again (50-98% conceive again), what is the reference for the 50-98% statistic?

METHODS

Lines 67-69:

Please reward the phrase "an advertisement that included language for African American and/or Hispanic women". It is not clear what this means and could be misinterpreted by readers.

Lines 74-80:

Thank you for providing a clear rationale as to why two distinct groups of non-pregnant women were recruited.

Lines 98-99:

What were the key components of the videos selected by the research team that you believed would cultivate emotional regulation and self-compassion? This is valuable information that could help future researchers.

Lines 113-121:

It is important that participant burden to complete questionnaires was considered before and after the yoga sessions. Please clarify if the research team felt the two, 1-item questionnaires for ER and SC (pre and post self-compassion and emotion regulation assessments) that were created to reduce participant burden measured what they intended to measure? For question 1, how did
women in the non-stillbirth group perceive the term: understanding toward yourself and your grief if this group had not experienced a stillbirth. Did they wonder what this meant? Was question 2 clearly understood by participants or did they require clarification what the question was asking?

RESULTS

Line 211

Typo: One of the remarked that (missing the word participants)

DISCUSSION

* Proofreading: Please check spacing between letters, missing periods.

Line 438–439:

The abbreviation of PTS was noted for the first time - the abbreviation could have been used earlier in the manuscript

Line 475: check/revise rewording: informative information

Line 477: check/revise rewording: high interest in women similar to
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