



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_7505
Title of the Manuscript:	Living with obstetric fistula: challenges and coping strategies among women attending the fistula clinic at Mulago hospital, Uganda

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have done a nice job of responding to the previous comments and improving the manuscript. Just a few little things need to be resolved: - The tables are numbered out of order in terms of appearance in the text. They are currently 1,4,2,3. - Line 105 says "All fistula patients (n=30) perceived injury by surgeon as a main cause of fistula." However, in Table 2 only 8 women (25%) seem to have said "injured by a surgeon" was the perceived cause. - Also in Table 2. What does "injured by self retaining catheter" mean? - Lines 108-110. In relation to perceived causes among patients' attendants, I still do not see the difference between "health service providers' mistakes (26%)" and "negligence by service providers" which is listed among the other causes. Why would those two categories not be added together? 134-137 and Table 3. The text and table are confusing. The text lists social challenges and then it says that 'other' social challenges are listed in the Table 3. What is in the text differs from what is in the table so it is not clear what women said. All of the results of what woman said were challenges should be included in the table, and then in the text a few statements could be made about the numbers in the table...what the most common challenges were, for example. - I still have a concern about the discussion section, where it seems that some statements are made that are not supported by results presented (or that the authors are presenting these results in the discussion section). Perhaps the journal editors can work with the authors on this. For example.... "Some women had lost their jobs and could not find work because of the stigma associated with the condition...." All that is mentioned in the result is that 80% of women were reported to be not working....but we have no idea how many were or were not working before their fistula (at least based on the results presented). - For the women, the loss of their children further deprived them of their last source of comfort[20]. (not sure why the reference is there as it appears this statement is related to the participants of this study. - Even where a husband remained socially supportive to the victim, they no longer enjoyed sexual relationships as the condition disgusts most men. Is this based on the data or just the general feeling the authors have? - Line 170-171. "Most women and at the time of interview were no longer in their marriages." Only 30% of the women were reported in Table 1 to be divorced/separated, so this statement is not correct based on the data. - Lines 173-175. "Another study that was conducted in five countries (including four in Africa) found that all the mothers were married and still living with their husbands[20]." As far as I can tell, this is not really accurate, although I am not sure what the authors mean by the term 'mothers'. Significantly fewer women were married at the time of their fistula repair than before the fistula occurred.	- We have revised the numbering of the tables and they are now numbered consecutively as tables 1,2,3,4, and 5. - Eight patients (27%) reported injury by surgeons. We have corrected the sentence (line 108) and it now corresponds with the right figure which is presented in Table 3. - The patients perceived causes OF as the injury to a Foleys urinary catheter inserted during or after delivery. We have revised the phrase to be more descriptive by adding "injured by a self-retaining Foleys urinary catheter". (See lines 109-110 in the narrative and line 297 Table 3). - These views were abstracted from FGDs with patient attendants. We have removed the percentages and merged provider mistakes with negligence (lines 110 and 111). - This error was caused by the inconsistent numbering of tables, which has now been corrected. The text referred to (now line 135-137) corresponds with Table 4. - We have reviewed and revised the discussion to minimise repeat of findings and ensure alignment with the results presented. - To ensure alignment with the findings, we have revised this statement to refer to the women being unemployed' rather than loss of jobs (lines 164) - This statement has been deleted. We have also revised the statements related to the loss of children and marriage (lines 161) - These statements have also been deleted - This statement was deleted from the discussion - We have reviewed and revised the discussion to minimise repeat of findings and alignment with the results presented.