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Reviewer’s report:

Factors associated with lack of Postnatal Care
among Palestinian Women: A cross-sectional study
in three Clinics in West Bank

Enas Dhaher, Rafael T Mikolajczyk, Annette E Maxwell & Alexander Krämer

This paper is an interesting study into issues surrounding the uptake of postnatal care in Palestine. This questionnaire-based study is well described and well analysed.

The limitations of the study are generally well described/ highlighted.

• Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I would like to see in the Methods section a sentence stating ‘A copy of the questionnaire in the English language is available from the first author’.

On page 3 after World Health Organization the authors should ass ‘(WHO)’ as they use this abbreviation later in the text.

I would like to see a reference to the reasons for conducting ‘pilot studies’ in the Methods (page 5).

The last sentence of the section Sample and instrument needs a short explanation. How was the questionnaire shortened from 35 to 25-30 minutes. Perhaps the authors removed one or two sentences, or they changed open-ended questions which required writing an answer to multiple choice questions which are faster to complete?

There are several words missing in the text, the final text needs to be proof-read one more time.

On page 7 do the authors really mean “.. received ‘counseling’ on family planning and breast feeding” or do they really mean something like “received advice on family planning and breast feeding? The word is used again in the same circumstance on page 9!
Page 8 the sentence “We did not include women’s attitude regarding the importance of postnatal care, because attitude might be influenced by the actual behavior rather than the other way round”, really needs a reference supporting this claim.

On page 10 the heading “Attitudes toward the necessity of postnatal care and reasons for not obtaining it” is too long and unwieldy. I suggest shorten it to something like: “Attitudes toward postnatal care and reasons non-use”

Page 10 The last sentence above the DISCUSSION needs explanation. The previous experience referred to as off putting, surely means a negative previous experience, rather than any experience of postnatal care with a previous baby?

In the text “et al.” is always with a full stop after al. as it is an abbreviation.

On page 12 the authors mention road blocks and check points, I have only seen photographs of this, but to me as an outsider this could be another barrier to seeking postnatal care. You travel as a highly pregnant woman through road blocks and check points because you feel hospital is the best place to deliver (rightly or wrongly), however if you not already convinced of the usefulness of postnatal care and you face road blocks and check points, you are less likely to go for postnatal care.

Table 2
Women age (in whole years) not [per year]
No. of living children [per child] seems odd, should this not be living children per woman?

Fig 2
Some heading at the bottom are with capitals others without, I suggest all with Capitals.

**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, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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