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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Miss Colette Homan,

This letter provides point-by-point responses to the issues raised by the reviewers. We have highlighted all changes in the main manuscript.

Editorial request:

1. **Editorial comment:**

   As the qualitative data for this study originates from the same set of focus groups/interviews as your recently published manuscript [http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/10/43](http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/10/43), we ask that you cite the published article in your references and make it clear the results originate from the same qualitative study.

   **Authors’ response:**

   The citation of our recently published manuscript has been updated. We have clarified in the main text that the data were derived from the same set of focus group discussions and in-depth interviews, as follows

   “As mentioned earlier, the present analysis will focus on antenatal and postnatal services, as we have reported on delivery care services elsewhere [30]. Data used in this study were derived from the same set of focus group discussions and in-depth interviews.” (Methods section, page 7)

2. **Editorial comment:**

   Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style ([http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals](http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals)). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.

   **Authors’ response:**

   The manuscript has been revised to conform to the journal style.

Reviewer 5 report: Dr Stella Babalola

1. **Reviewer’s comment:**

   Reviewer's report - The formatting of the Discussion into two sections - Main findings and Factors influencing ..- is confusing. The discussion section should consider all the main findings, compare them with what existing literature says and derive their programmatic and policy implications.

   **Authors’ response:**

   We agree with the reviewer’s comment that the discussion section should consider all the main findings and compare them with the existing literature. In the revised manuscript, our discussion section has been divided into five parts under five sub-
headings. The first part, “Main findings” highlights the key findings in this study in relation to our research questions. In part two until part four we discussed the key findings in relation to evidence from the existing literature and to derive the related programmatic and policy implications, as mentioned by the reviewer. The last part (part five) contains the strengths and limitations of this study. To avoid confusion, as mentioned by the reviewer, we have changed the second sub-heading into “The use of antenatal and postnatal care services”.

2. **Reviewer’s comment:**
The limitations of the study should be come at the end of the discussion.

**Authors’ response:**
As suggested by the reviewer, the limitations of the study have been moved to the end of the discussion under a sub-heading of “Strengths and limitations”.

3. **Reviewer’s comment:**
The explanation provided by the authors for not providing the proportion of the sample with at least 4 antenatal visit is not tenable. Note that the authors provided the percentage with any antenatal care (page 7). However the DHS data provided on page 5 had to do with 4 or more antenatal visits. Do the authors have this information from their sample? Otherwise, could they provide the percentage with any antenatal visit from the DHS on page 5?

**Authors’ response:**
As suggested by the reviewer, the percentage with any antenatal visits from DHS has been provided on page 5 (Introduction section), as follows,

> “Although the 2007 IDHS reported that 95% of pregnant women in Indonesia attended at least one antenatal visit, only 66% of mothers (58% in rural areas and 77% in urban areas) attended at least four antenatal care services as recommended.”

**Additional comments from Associate Editor:**

1. **Editor’s comment:**
The authors have responded to the reviewers' comments satisfactorily. I recommend again that they copyedit the paper carefully into a final version which they are happy to see published. Grammatical errors persist. At the same time, I suggest that they see if there are sentences that could be shortened.

**Authors’ response:**
As suggested by the associate editor, the paper has been edited and checked by an English language editor.

2. **Editor’s comment:**
Figure 1: Amend to "Sampling frame for the qualitative..."
Table 1: abbreviations such as ANC should be given in full in a footnote to the table.

Authors’ response:
We thank the associate editor for identifying this. The title of Figure 1 has been revised, and a footnote has been added to explain all the abbreviations used in the Table 1.

We hope these responses meet your requirements and allow our article to be published in the BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.

Yours sincerely,

Christiana R Titaley