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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](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) | The views of nurses and other healthcare workers on interventions to reduce disrespectful maternity care in rural health facilities in Kilifi and Kisii counties, Kenya: analysis of a qualitative interview study |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AUTHORS             | Lusambili, Adelaide; Obure, Jerim; Wisofschi, Stefania; Nyaga, Lucy; Mulama, Kennedy; Temmerman, Marleen |

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| REVIEWER | Freeman, Paul  
University of Washington School of Public Health, Global Health |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| REVIEW RETURNED | 18-Oct-2021 |
| GENERAL COMMENTS | This is an important study. The only area for improvement would be to include a more detailed discussion of the limitations of the study. However this is not an absolute impediment to acceptance. |

| REVIEWER | Madiba , Sphiwe  
Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, Department of Public Health |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| REVIEW RETURNED | 21-Oct-2021 |
| GENERAL COMMENTS | Thank you for the opportunity to review this very important well written qualitative study that addresses an important topic on respectful maternity care.  
A few elements need to be addressed:  
Methods  
I. While the authors explain that the context of the study is described elsewhere, it would be useful to provide a bit more information on the study setting. I found it difficult to have a mental picture of the facilities referred to in the responses of the HCWs. Since the article is intended for an international readership, this should be clarified to appreciate the findings. In addition, more information on the criteria of selection of HCWs should be clarified |
I. It would be useful to provide a bit more information on the demographics such as the age, years of experience, qualification, etc., of the HCWs to give context to their responses and recommendations.

II. While I understand that the transcripts were transcribed verbatim, it is not easy to get the message that the participants intended to convey.

III. There is no need to add “ID” in the descriptors of the participants because only in-depth interviews were conducted.

Minor points:
Page 2 lines 65-69: This sentence is too long, consider breaking it into two sentences.
Page 2 lines 77-81: this sentence is also too long, consider breaking it into two sentences.
Page 2 line 91: Write RMC in full the first time.
Page 6 line 321: Ref is missing.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Dr. Bishwalata Rajkumari, Jawaharlal Nehru Institute of Medical Sciences
Comments to the Author:
The article does not follow standard report guidelines for qualitative studies.
While this is an important observation, it would have been useful to identify specific areas and provide insights on how it can be improved. I find it particularly difficult to respond to a ‘statement’.
The article looks very similar to authors own previous publication in reference number 2. Duplicate publication and self-citation cannot be ruled out for the submitted article.
• We have included the study guide
• We have made the aims of our three papers from this study clear
• We have responded to the editor’s initial questions.

Reviewer: 2
Dr. Paul Freeman, University of Washington School of Public Health
Comments to the Author:
This is an important study. The only area for improvement would be to include a more detailed discussion of the limitations of the study. However this is not an absolute impediment to acceptance
Thank you. We have added more content in the limitation sections

Reviewer: 3
Dr. Sphiwe Madiba, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University
Comments to the Author:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this very important well written qualitative study that addresses an important topic on respectful maternity care. Thank you

A few elements need to be addressed:

Methods
I. While the authors explain that the context of the study is described elsewhere, it would be useful to provide a bit more information on the study setting. I found it difficult to have a mental picture of the facilities referred to in the responses of the HCWs. Since the article is intended for an international readership, this should be clarified to appreciate the findings. In addition, more information on the
criteria of selection of HCWs should be clarified
Thank you. We have added more content in the methods to include facility characteristics and the criteria of selecting the health care workers we interviewed in the two settings.

Results
I. It would be useful to provide a bit more information on the demographics such as the age, years of experience, qualification, etc., of the HCWs to give context to their responses and recommendations.

Thank you. We only interviewed HCWs who had worked in the facilities during the AQCESS project interventions for at least one year. We did not focus on the age experience and this is recommended as a limitation of the study.

II. While I understand that the transcripts were transcribed verbatim, it is not easy to get the message that the participants intended to convey.

I don’t understand this question because the message conveyed is illustrated throughout in the findings. During transcription process the transcriber can only transcribe the data as it is said by the interviewer.

III. There is no need to add “ID” in the descriptors of the participants because only in-depth interviews were conducted.

Thank you. We have left this to remind the reader. Also, if I find nothing wrong reporting this way.

Minor points:
Page 2 lines 65-69: This sentence is too long, consider breaking it into two sentences. Done.
Page 2 lines 77-81: this sentence is also too long, consider breaking it into two sentences. Done
Page 2 line 91: Write RMC in full the first time. Done
Page 6 line 321: Ref is missing. In line 321 we are reporting the findings which are supported by a quote and we don’t need a reference.