

*Mayberry manuscript #2005/108*

*Editorial comments #1:*

Authors addressed many of the changes. For the most part the paper reads well and has some interesting findings. There were many criticisms raised by reviewers but the changes that were made I think strengthen the paper. I agree that there is still a disconnect between the model and the discussion. There needs to be a separate discussion of the model ... operationalized so that the reader can see the value of even having the model included.

The problem is that some of the components of the model are used as headings in the paper and then some of the content in a few boxes are not discussed or integrated into another discussion.

Are the major constructs

Problem, Design overall plan, Participants, Developing Protocol, The Review, Creating the Review Documents, Finalize the Review, Disseminate, and Outcomes ...with feedback? What happens is that the model also includes e.g. from the study within the model increasing its confusion. Maybe the title of the figure should be linking the MCA Translation Model with Vaginal or Cesarean Births.

P7...last paragraph MCA leaders were deeply concerned” repetitious with Paragraph 1 on p6.

P7 paragraph 1 “in response” either eliminate or write in response to what

P8 Many pronouns...throughout. I think they may compromise research papers. They are present throughout the document. last paragraph ...omit “she” ...”We’ on p.9, 10 and “Our Model..” Our " p16; or our evidence, p15” etc. ...wonder if it should “we could be “the team...or the research team; "Our" ...or ”the Model used in this investigation” etc. These can be edited and would not hold the paper up for that. Also, check tense shifts throughout. In general

the document is much clearer and with addressing the model issue I would accept. If you feel that this work can be done “in house” that is ok with me.

***Editorial comments #2:***

It looks good to me with two exceptions. There is still somewhat of a disconnect between headings and model (figure 1) including having the problem described differently in the text and Figure 1. Figure 1 needs refinement - at least on my computer, I can't see everything that I believe should be in the boxes.