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Reviewer’s report:

When assessing the work, I considered the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Although the authors have shed light on the question, however, the importance of the study is not described well and not sufficient.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods described by the authors are satisfactory.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, the data are sound.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, but more works to be done. There are numerous grammatical errors and citing the references. More attention should be paid to do the MS error free.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, but the authors did not provide any policy recommendations. It is suggested that the authors should provide policy recommendation on the basis of the findings.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, it is done properly.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   No.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes, it is satisfactory.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   As I stated earlier, the authors should pay much attention to improve the writing quality of the MS.
In addition, some (not all) errors are mentioned in the following:

Write down the survey date properly.
The reference number should be given before the full stop (.)
Antenatal care has been written sometimes by two phrases Ante and natal and sometimes as together ‘antenatal’. The word should be written as “antenatal”.
Use always % sign.
It is not clear what type of consent “verbal” or “written” was taken from the respondents.
Put reference in describing the Busia district in the early of ‘study area’ section in ‘data set’.
In result section, respondent’s characteristics should be given first then the discussion of the findings. To do so, the authors are suggested to provide a separate table to describe the
Use trimester rather than semester throughout the MS.
There is no policy implication. Since the outcome variable is an important issue in the developing countries like Uganda, the author(s) should provide some policy recommendations on the basis of the findings.
Page 3, para 1, line 6, delete the extra ‘t’ from the sentence.
Page 3, para 1, line 19-24: rewrite the sentence adding preposition.
Page 3, para 2, line 36-37, reword ‘held’ by conducted.
These are not all. The authors are suggested to go through the full MS to present an errorless research.