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Reviewer’s report:

major compulsory revisions
1. all authors seem to be external people. Are there no local people who have contributed as authors to this paper?
2. have no authors from the field which is the subject of study (e.g. midwives, clinicians) contributed to the paper?
3. methods: by taking women who bring their children for vaccination, you introduce a bias, which should be stated very clearly in the methods; there are many parts in the methods section, which are results.
4. results pag 8-10: you say "the majority of women in our sample" and in the next sentence you state: "Most women reported ..". According to your table "the majority"is 68.9% and "most women" is 53.2%. 53.2% is also the majority, but definitely not "most". Be more specific and just give the actual figures. In the next sentence you state: ".. only 17-19% of the women reported being informed about danger signs related to the mother's or the baby's health .." According to the table 17% related to the baby and 19% to the mother, therefore change the ranking.

I do not understand the meaning of "previous experience" in text on page 10 just before discussion as well as in figure 2 ("have experience"). Experience of what?

5. Discussion page 11: You state that it is important to increase this rate (of utilization of postpartum care) in order to lower maternal mortality in these countries. This statement cannot be made on the basis of the findings of this study: you did not report any maternal death inb those who did not use postpartum health care!

6. Discussion page 12: I do not understand the sentence just before risk factors for non-use: "This underscores the importance of providing all women with proper postnatal care at the hospital level and at the primary health care level that including providing information regarding potential complications in the postnatal period." Apart from incorrect english, I cannot understand that delay in crossing checkpoints (which in itself is a human right’s violation) has\ anything to do with hospital or primary health care level.

Minor essential revisions:
1. background page 3: I do not think that "6 months post delivery" check up has\anything to do with maternal health care. Change "birth mothers", that is no
term normally used.

2. methods page 5: "We chose the clinics that .. had the most patients ..". "The most" is not correct. Under data collection: "previous experience working women" must be "previous experience of working with women".

3. methods page 6: "Women were approached after they had received the health care service". You can receive "health care", but not "the health care service". The last sentence on page 6 under "dependent variable" is so self-evident that I would say: just omit. Apart from that: 13 women, 4.9% missing is a result.

4. methods page 7: what you have stated between brackets after "level of education" under statistical analysis page 7. You already stated this under independent variables.

3. results page 9: "multivariable logistic regression must be "multivariate".

4. discussion page 13: "instrument-assisted delivery" is called "instrumental vaginal delivery" in obstetrics. (also in table 1)

5. limitations page 14: "UNRWA primary health care". Only use abbreviations if you first have given the whole name.
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