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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

thank you for giving me this opportunity to review this important manuscript on neonatal health in Tanzania. below are my comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The abstract should detail the methods to clarify what was done (number interviewed, analysis done etc). This will enable the reader decide if to read the rest of the manuscript. There are also figures which I couldn't understand in the results section of the abstract. For instance how can 11 mothers be 13.8% yet 69 mothers are given as 8.7%? Also, the first sentence of the conclusion section seems to be incomplete.

2. The introduction section of the manuscript should have current literature e.g the number of neonatal deaths globally is no longer estimated at four millions. The author should also rewrite this section to reflect issues of quality. Currently, this is lacking yet quality seems to be the main focus of the manuscript.

3. Methods section - This should be rewritten to clarify the number of respondents involved and how they were selected. The authors should also further clarify the analysis done in STATA (what statistics and how computed?) and how "theme" building was done for the qualitative data.

4. Results section - In a couple of places information which should be in the methods section is put under results. This should be moved back to methods (e.g most of the first paragraph of the results section).

5. Discussion section - Ideally (and I think this is the practice for BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth journal) results should be separated from the discussion. The authors are advised to separate the results from the discussion. In addition, the qualitative and quantitative results should be discussed together on not separately as the authors do. So there should be separate results and discussion sections. The authors should add a methodological considerations paragraph/sub-section to the discussion. Finally, the conclusions paragraph should be revised to reflect "quality" which is the main focus of the paper. The authors should make their own inferences about the findings and not what the mothers think.

Minor Essential Revisions
The language needs fixing in a number of places

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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