

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Public provision of emergency obstetric care: A case study in two districts of Pakistan
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Brückmann, Peter; Hashmi, Ashfa; Kuch, Marina; Kuhnt, Jana; Monfared, Ida; Vollmer, Sebastian

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Veena Iyer Associate Professor, Indian Institute of Public Health Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	13-Nov-2018

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Lines 80 to 86 - Its not clear whether CMWs are expected to conduct births at BHUs? Research question needs to be more clearly defined Redo line 93-95. Sentence structure Redo line 116 to 119. Sentence structure Line 126 - Need to state who in health facilities was interviewed. Must be a person, like the CMWs Line 128 - ...drug and infrastructure assessment (has been) was conducted. Line 131 - midwifery homes? The section on Analysis must state only the method of analysis used. There is an overall opinion in maternal health field to avoid using the word "deliveries" and instead use "births". [Although communities themselves call them deliveries! ;)] Need to realign language through out the manuscript accordingly.</p> <p>A lot of the results have gone into the discussion section. The analysis attempted is a simple descriptive analysis. It needs to be brought out into a few clear-cut points. The findings need to be crystallized further into better designed and comprehensive tables. Discussion section needs to be developed.</p> <p>What is the size of private health care in the two study districts? Are they CEMOCs? This information is necessary since conclusions are being drawn at district level.</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Humaira Maheen Melbourne School of Population and Global Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	27-Nov-2018

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	This author conducts an audit of EMoC services delivered in 22 health facilities and Community Midwives Clinics. The study aims to investigate the current status of delivery of EmoC services in
-------------------------	---

	<p>the two rural districts of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan. Information about the survey instrument is insufficient. The poor provision of EmoC services in rural districts of Pakistan has been well described by many studies in the past, including Mian et al. 2016, Ansari et al., 2015, Utz et al., 2015; Turab et al. 2013, Ali M, 2005, 2007, 2008 however, the authors did not refer to any of these articles in the study. In addition, the authors did not rationalise why auditing the EmoC service delivery of the two districts was important. Moreover, discussion the merits/demerits of privatisation of BHUs and challenges of implementing CMW program are important things when discussing the poor provision of EmoC services by the two providers. Also, the article needs to be written in a way that people with limited knowledge about Pakistan health system can understand as well, at the moment the description is not very clear. More context of KPK and primary health care system would be helpful.</p> <p>- The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
--	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

#### Reviewer 1

Lines 80 to 86 – It is not clear whether CMWs are expected to conduct births at BHUs?

- Please find further clarifications added to the text.

Research question needs to be more clearly defined

- More information is added to address this point (please see the last paragraph in Background section).

Redo line 93-95. Sentence structure

- Redone

Redo line 116 to 119. Sentence structure

- Redone

Line 126 - Need to state who in health facilities was interviewed. Must be a person, like the CMWs

- Clarified

Line 128 - ...drug and infrastructure assessment (has been) was conducted.

- Amended

Line 131 - midwifery homes?

- Amended

The section on Analysis must state only the method of analysis used.

- Amended

There is an overall opinion in maternal health field to avoid using the word "deliveries" and instead use "births". [Although communities themselves call them deliveries! ;)] Need to realign language throughout the manuscript accordingly.

- Amended throughout the text accordingly

A lot of the results have gone into the discussion section.

The analysis attempted is a simple descriptive analysis. It needs to be brought out into a few clear-cut points. The findings need to be crystallized further into better designed and comprehensive tables.

Discussion section needs to be developed.

- We have restructured results and discussion sections such that results are in the results section and not in the discussion section. We have further expanded the discussion section.

What is the size of private health care in the two study districts? Are they CEmOCs? This information is necessary since conclusions are being drawn at district level.

- More information is added to address this point (please see the second paragraph under Methods- subsection Study setting).

Reviewer 2

This author conducts an audit of EMoC services delivered in 22 health facilities and Community Midwives Clinics. The study aims to investigate the current status of delivery of EmoC services in the two rural districts of the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan.

Information about the survey instrument is insufficient.

- Further information have been added to the context (please see subsection Study sample and survey questionnaires).

The poor provision of EmoC services in rural districts of Pakistan has been well described by many studies in the past, including Mian et al. 2016, Ansari et al., 2015, Utz et al., 2015; Turab et al. 2013, Ali M, 2005, 2007, 2008 however, the authors did not refer to any of these articles in the study.

- These studies as well as a few more were added to provide additional support clarifying the purpose of the present study.

In addition, the authors did not rationalise why auditing the EmoC service delivery of the two districts was important.

- More information is added to address this point (please see last paragraph in Background section and paragraphs 1 and 2 under Method-subsection Study setting).

Moreover, discussion the merits/demerits of privatisation of BHUs and challenges of implementing CMW program are important things when discussing the poor provision of EmoC services by the two providers.

- Further context is added (please see paragraph one in Discussion section).

Also, the article needs to be written in a way that people with limited knowledge about Pakistan health system can understand as well, at the moment the description is not very clear. More context of KPK and primary health care system would be helpful.

- Further information has been added in different parts of the text to address this point.

Editors Comments:

- Please revise the title of your manuscript to include the research question, study design and setting. This is the preferred format of the journal.

- The title is revised accordingly.

- Please ensure that your abstract is formatted according to our Instructions for Authors: [http://bmjopen.bmj.com/pages/authors/#research\\_articles](http://bmjopen.bmj.com/pages/authors/#research_articles)

- The abstract is reformatted accordingly.

- Please revise the 'Strengths and limitations' section of your manuscript (after the abstract). This section should contain five short bullet points, no longer than one sentence each, that relate specifically to the methods.

- This section is revised now containing five short bullet points.

- Along with your revised manuscript, please include a copy of the STROBE checklist indicating the page/line numbers of your manuscript where the relevant information can be found (<https://strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=strobe-home>)

### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Veena Iyer Indian Institute of Public Health Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	04-Mar-2019
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The analysis is a very basic descriptive analysis. The background and methods sections need to be very well articulated and crisp in

	<p>order to bring out the simple message in the results, and then juxtapose them against existing literature in the discussion.</p> <p>- The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
--	--

## VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

thank you very much for your consideration. We have adjusted the strengths and limitations section as requested.