

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Validity and reliability of maternal recall of pregnancy history and service use among signing Deaf women: A cross-sectional descriptive study from South Africa.
AUTHORS	Fontes Marx, Mayara; Heap, Marion; Gichane, Margaret W.; London, Leslie

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr. Swati Chitnis Mayflower Women’s Hospital, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India
REVIEW RETURNED	24-May-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Study has appropriately addressed issues in communication with disabled women.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Maggie Redshaw NPEU, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Jun-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an interesting methodologically oriented paper which follows on from a previous one on deaf and signing women’s experience of maternity care in Cape Town, South Africa.</p> <p>The title which is 26 words long needs to be shortened.</p> <p>The background and methods are described quite well.</p> <p>However, the short time interval for checking on the reliability of the questionnaire used and interpreted with SASL is of concern. 10-30 mins is an inadequate period over which to check reliability. The authors acknowledge this to some extent, but further research should remedy this issue, with a larger sample size (7 is insufficient, though useful as a pilot.)</p> <p>The validity component of the study could be emphasised more and the findings could be re-ordered in the results section and also the abstract. The reliability section could be shortened.</p> <p>Points made in the methods and discussion sections are of interest in reflecting the practical issues associated with data collection in the research process and in relation to setting up and running a healthcare records system in the context described and more broadly.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Other non-LMICs research does refer to comparisons with record systems, e.g. Quigley, M. A., C. Hockley and L. L. Davidson (2007). "Agreement between hospital records and maternal recall of mode of delivery: evidence from 12 391 deliveries in the UK Millennium Cohort Study." BJOG 114(2): 195-200.</p> <p>Minor typological errors needed to be addressed. There are some missing words and on page 11, para 1 'completed' should be 'completely'.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer's Reports:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Dr. Swati Chitnis

Institution and Country: Mayflower Women's Hospital, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

6- Study has appropriately addressed issues in communication with disabled women.

Thank you for your feedback and for reviewing our paper.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Maggie Redshaw

Institution and Country: NPEU, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': 'None declared'

7- This is an interesting methodologically oriented paper which follows on from a previous one on deaf and signing women's experience of maternity care in Cape Town, South Africa.

Thank you for your feedback.

8- The title which is 26 words long needs to be shortened.

Thank you for the suggestion. We have made the title slightly shorter whilst including design in the title (23 words) - "Validity and reliability of maternal recall of pregnancy history and service use among signing Deaf women: A cross-sectional descriptive Study from South Africa."

9- The background and methods are described quite well.

Thank you for your feedback.

10- However, the short time interval for checking on the reliability of the questionnaire used and interpreted with SASL is of concern. 10-30 mins is an inadequate period over which to check reliability. The authors acknowledge this to some extent, but further research should remedy this issue, with a larger sample size (7 is insufficient, though useful as a pilot.)

Thank you for your feedback. Although, within 30 minutes re-interviewing has been used in other studies, we acknowledge that it is a limitation and we have recognized this in the section on limitations.

11- The validity component of the study could be emphasised more and the findings could be re-ordered in the results section and also the abstract. The reliability section could be shortened.

Thank you for your suggestion. We are following most reliability and validity studies ordered whereas the results first describe the reliability then validity. We believe that the shortening the reliability session would deprive the reader of valuable information, and therefore we elect to keep the reliability section equally emphasized. We note the first reviewer did not express any concern over this balance.

12- Points made in the methods and discussion sections are of interest in reflecting the practical issues associated with data collection in the research process and in relation to setting up and running a healthcare records system in the context described and more broadly.

Thank you for your feedback.

13- Other non-LMICs research does refer to comparisons with record systems, e.g. Quigley, M. A., C. Hockley and L. L. Davidson (2007). "Agreement between hospital records and maternal recall of mode of delivery: evidence from 12 391 deliveries in the UK Millennium Cohort Study." BJOG 114(2): 195-200.

We have added a sentence recognizing some of the HIC research in this area, including the reference suggested by the reviewer.

14- Minor typological errors needed to be addressed. There are some missing words and on page 11, para 1 'completed' should be 'completely'.

Thank you for picking up this inconsistency. We have revised the manuscript accordingly and corrected the manuscript for language and grammar.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Maggie Redshaw National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford.
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Oct-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	The points raised in the initial review have been addressed in this revision.