

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) | From evidence to tailored decision-making: A qualitative research of barriers and facilitating factors for the implementation of non-clinical interventions to reduce unnecessary caesarean section in Romania |
| AUTHORS | Berdzuli, Nino; Llop-Gironés, Alba; Farcasanu, Dana; Butu, Cassandra; Grbic, Miljana; Betran, Ana Pilar |

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Sorrentino, Felice University of Foggia |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 10-Jul-2023 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>I read with great interest the Manuscript titled "FROM EVIDENCE TO TAILORED DECISION-MAKING: UNDERSTANDING HOW TO IMPLEMENT NON-CLINICAL INTERVENTIONS FOR THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY CAESAREAN SECTIONS IN ROMANIA" with falls within the aim of the Journal.</p> <p>In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting enough to attract the readers' attention. Methodology is accurate and conclusions are supported by the data analysis. Nevertheless, authors should clarify some point and improve the discussion citing relevant and novel key articles about the topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Typos errors must be corrected.-Moreover, the whole text should be corrected by a native English speaker in order to make the work clearer and more readable.-The introduction should be extended and completed. (see PMID: 36143932).-Inclusion/exclusion criteria should be better clarified by extending their description.- Discussions can be expanded and improved by citing international guidelines about CS on maternal request (see PMID: 36768071) <p>Considered all this points, I think it could be of interest for the readers and, in my opinion, it deserves the priority to be published after minor revisions.</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Akadri, Adebayo Babcock University, Obstetrics and gynaecology |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 06-Aug-2023 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>The manuscript is generally well written. Only minor revision needed.</p> <p>The authors should provide more details on how the respondents were selected.</p> |
|-------------------------|---|

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Felice Sorrentino, University of Foggia

Comments to the Author:

I read with great interest the Manuscript titled "FROM EVIDENCE TO TAILORED DECISION-MAKING: UNDERSTANDING HOW TO IMPLEMENT NON-CLINICAL INTERVENTIONS FOR THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY CAESAREAN SECTIONS IN ROMANIA" with falls within the aim of the Journal. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting enough to attract the readers' attention. Methodology is accurate and conclusions are supported by the data analysis. Nevertheless, authors should clarify some point and improve the discussion citing relevant and novel key articles about the topic.

Typos errors must be corrected. Moreover, the whole text should be corrected by a native English speaker in order to make the work clearer and more readable.

Typo in page 9 is now addressed. The main text has been reviewed by a native English speaker.

The introduction should be extended and completed. (see PMID: 36143932).

The review article suggested has been included in the introduction.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria should be better clarified by extending their description.

Information on the selection of the population has been included in page 4, line 18-24.

Discussions can be expanded and improved by citing international guidelines about CS on maternal request (see PMID: 36768071)

The study is based on WHO expertise and the WHO [recommendations](#): non-clinical interventions to reduce unnecessary caesarean sections. The discussion section follows the same logic and addresses the women, health professionals and managers views as well as the systemic factors that might contribute to unnecessary caesarean section.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Adebayo Akadri, Babcock University

Comments to the Author:

The manuscript is generally well written. Only minor revision needed.

The authors should provide more details on how the respondents were selected.

Information on the selection of the population has been included in page 4, line 18-24.

Reference for routine hospital data in Romania

The reference for routine hospital data is not provided as it is not publicly available. Also, the typo in page 9 is now addressed

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Akadri, Adebayo Babcock University, Obstetrics and gynaecology |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 11-Oct-2023 |
| GENERAL COMMENTS | The authors have effected all the suggested corrections. The article is fit for publication |