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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The question posed was not well defined but when someone reads the last paragraph under the introduction, then an assumption is just made. Let the author(s) state the exact question.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Most of the aspects are well described. The entire formula used for sample size calculation should be shown for future readers to appreciate the proportions used and to ensure authenticity. Another researcher can do such a study in different setting.

3. Are the data sound? Most of the data is sound. However, I feel that the <18 years should not have been excluded from the study. This is an age group with unique issues and quite often, the adolescents end up receiving poor care. They are commonly treated as emancipated minors or a consent and assent could be signed. Under sample size section; the author should edit “a minimum maximum sample size and just inform us whether the 396 was the maximum sample size or not…….”

The author should inform us how many study participants were exactly recruited from each of the eight facilities. The aspect of systematic random sampling is stated, but what exactly was done?

The author should state that dependent variable “quality antenatal care” was obtained from client satisfaction which is just a proxy measurement for quality of care which has some limitations depending on how satisfaction is assessed especially where the expected quality is unknown.

The author should state one of the limitations as failure to assess the “presence of a birth plan and complication readiness plan” for each of the study participants as part of the quality component.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Most of the aspects were covered, but some statements should be rephrased or information added for clarity.

Under outcome attributes,: the 12 items that measured client satisfaction should be stated or refer the reader to table that has that information.

In table 2: Item “provider performs the procedure with cleanliness and sanitation”.


Under predictors of client satisfaction with antenatal care: The information in table 3 is almost all repeated in the text. It is better to pick out the salient issues that one would like to comment and whatever else is not in the table. It should be edited to avoid repetition.

Under the discussion section: Should edit sentence number 2 in the first paragraph. It starts off with “This would make the identification of women…………………………management”.

The explanation for the big difference in the findings in the present study and the DHS of 2005 may not be just because of the sample size, but there could have been other changes over time such as training staff about importance certain aspects and availability of equipment such as BP machines.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
To a certain degree yes; however, there is need for some edits as already suggested.
The conclusion needs rephrasing to come out strongly based on the objective of the study and the key results.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? In fact he should create a subheading and state the limitations clearly. E.g the sentence before reaching the paragraph for conclusion where the author says something about bias should be stated as a limitation.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, those aspects are coming out.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes, to a certain degree. However, he should rephrase the sentences under conclusion to clearly state something about quality of ANC as depicted by results

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, but should insert the suggested edits

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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