



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_16380
Title of the Manuscript:	Providers' perception of quality of care and constraints to delivery of quality maternal health services in primary health centers of Southeast Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>Have not adequately addressed the comments shared in the previous review.</p> <p>Conceptual clarity is still lacking with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The rationale for undertaking the study and focus on the health service provider (introduction does not make a strong case). b) Disconnect between research approach and steps detailed to undertake data collection, analysis and presentation of findings. The questions presented in the guide are not in keeping with a qualitative research approach where the emphasis is on sharing the lived experience. The questions are closed ended. It still appears that this is a mixed methods study and not a qualitative descriptive study. c) The writing style (poor grammar and sentence structure, incomplete sentences, vague sentences) make this paper a difficult read. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Providers perception in the area off quality of care is limited. Our view is that if their perceptions of constraints are combined with that from clients that it will lead to positive interventions by policy makers. This is of importance bearing in mind the burden of maternal mortality in Nigeria.</p> <p>There has been improvements in maternal health service delivery at the health centers with the fencing of some of the health centers with functional gates and security personnel since after the study.</p> <p>The study on design was a qualitative descriptive study. The error of close ended questions admitted, however the questions served as guide and probes were used. The study may never stand as a mixed method. One of the reviewers was of the opinion that sample size of 24 was small for the study. Even though the assistants to the OICs were originally included in the study they were removed because they constantly referred us to the OICs for clarifications on almost all issues. That is why we named the OICs as the chief service providers. If this study is classified as a mixed method study, it will immediately fail the test and number one flaw will be sample size. We eventually removed all the tables (good advice from the reviewers from onset) and presented the results under themes.</p> <p>Corrections have been made on the poor grammar and sentence structures.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>