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Comments:

This article contains relevant information and looks promising. However, the article needs major revision and editing. I encourage authors to revise the manuscript. See suggestions below

Major

1. Title:
It says “the effect of health facility delivery on neonatal mortality”, it dictates that as if the review is limited to comparative study on the basis of place of delivery and neonatal mortality. It seems it doesn’t match with what has been done; needs some reconsideration.

2. Introduction
Last paragraph: purposes of review….to clear conflicting ideas…. Are authors now feeling that they have settled these conflicting ideas? It needs to be revised.

3. Methods:
Inclusion and exclusion criteria
3a. The inclusion criteria don’t match the central purpose of the review one may guess from the title. They need to be fitted.
3b. Authors mentioned that there was no time limit of publication to be included. This is unacceptable. Either they need to conduct trend analysis or limit time to the most recent publications.
3c. Authors mixed published articles done by different designs. If possible, compare the effect by different designs or include homogenous design.

4. Results
1a. Authors accessed quite a large number of articles. That is really good. However, finally they just left with very few probably due to the exclusion criteria. The conclusion they drawn from these few articles may not be convincing. So, either they need to revise their criteria or search for more articles to be included to come up a more precise estimate.
1b. Table 2 the direction of RR is not clear; if you include column for facility and home delivery it may be clear. I couldn’t find figure two which you cited in text.

Overall

a. Avoid phrases like “insert table here”, redundancy of sentences/phrases mentioned in methods section repeated in result section.

b. How do you ensure that the populations included in the original study only differ by place of delivery? What measures you applied in selecting article to ensure such similarity?

c. It is not within the scope of this review to indicate the entire necessary language edition; the document needs thorough language edition.

Minor:

1. Methods

1a. 235 out of 263 articles were excluded at initial screening for their relevance or irrelevance? Why did authors all these irrelevant articles?

1b. Out of the remaining 28 articles, 17 didn’t fulfill preset criteria. What type of criteria? Be specific.

1c. This review intended to measure randomly happening place of delivery….. What do you mean? What about mothers who participated in ANC services? Advice about place of delivery is part of ANC service. How did authors manage to exclude such inherent interventions? It is not clear.

2. Conclusion and recommendation:

Authors recommend expansion of health facility. Why is that? Does availability of facility guarantee utilization? Why you favor facility based delivery over attended delivery is not clear from the beginning?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs thorough language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

No conflict of interest

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.