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**Reviewer's report:**

The optimalisation of antenatal care attendance and skilled delivery in Uganda is very important. The initiatives taken to reach this goal are therefore very valuable.

Major compulsory revisions

1. In the abstract we read: (OR 1.72; 95% CI 2.31–2.12), however the OR must be a value within the confidence interval, the same is repeated in the results’ section, while table 2 shows correct figures - I suppose.

2. If the method of using estimated numbers is a currently used and accepted method, this is fine with me, the authors describe the following sentence in their reply to the authors, which looks good, however I cannot find him in the text.

Data on the estimated (expected) number of pregnant women in the first trimester was also collected from the health facility records. Based on the population demographics, the health facility with technical support from the district health office as well as MoH set the annual targets on expected pregnancies. These facility level targets then contributed to the district and national annual targets [24-25]”.

3. It would be good to specify the source (where did the information come from) of the ‘expected attendees’ and ‘ANC attendance to be tested’ in the tables.

4. The titles of the tables should be more extensive, explaining what the OR shows us.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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