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Reviewer's report:

This article revises barriers and facilitators of inter-conceptional care. This topic is important to prevent prematurity. These are the suggestions to enrich this manuscript:

Background
- Paragraph (P) 3: you mention “six peer-reviewed studies” but only gave the Ref for 5…what about the 6?
- P 3 refers to figure 1; is it figure 1A?
- P4 refers to figure 1b…but the figure is 1B. Be consistent with the way you name and cite the figures and tables. Use capital letter or small letters.
- Figure 1A,B not clear, it is not helping to understand the ideas explained in P3 and 4.

Results
- P 1 you need to refer to Table 1
- Revise the use of sign as %, be consistent.
- P4 needs review. Do you mean smokers are less likely to attend all visit vs no smokers?
- P2 use the word percent or %. Be consistent
- You mention two levels of interventions. You need to address about this levels in Methods
- P6: The predictive power of Model Components are not show in Table 4
- Last paragraph mentioned differences in demographics characteristics of smokers vs no smokers. Are these significant?
- I suggest explaining the results by table. It is confuse if the reader needs to go back to a previous table.

Discussion
- In general well done
- Some references are missed (eg. P1 “is one of the most comprehensive sets of factors known to…”(Ref)
- Even when the author operationalized almost all variables suggested as relevant to vulnerable population, I suggest reevaluating the way you
operationalized the variables (eg. Social support, perception of competing needs). Each instrument reflects a descriptive theory about a concept, as well as the parent conceptual model (Fawcett, 1999). I believe it’s too adventure concluding that the model is not capturing the barriers and facilitators.

Tables
- Too much information in tables. I suggest summarize.
- Include the predictive power of the models in the tables.
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