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Reviewer’s report:

I find that most of the recommendations from the first round of review have been accepted and changed. There are a few issues remaining as Minor Essential Revisions:

1. First paragraph of the introduction.
There is a reference to "guidelines in the area....". The reference cited by Prual et al, is however not a guideline, but a research paper. The proper guideline should be referenced - either USAID, UNFPA or WHO. There is a reference from WHO from 2007. In any case the latest guidelines must be referenced - not previous versions. If the intention of this paragraph is to introduce the concept that all pregnancies are risky, this could possibly be supported by research papers. In this case it should not refer to a guideline, but to the relevant research papers supporting the making of the new guideline. In any case this should be made clear.

2. Introduction last paragraph:
This paragraph introduces the aim of the paper - although not very clearly stated. The aim of the paper alludes to the previous sentence in which "factors affecting the quality of ANCE services is not well known". The paper does not, as far as I can see, present data on the factors affecting quality, but rather is a paper on the quality of services themselves. There is only very sparse reference to possible factors affecting quality in the discussion (which is relevant). There is a larger discussion on the factors affecting client satisfaction. These elements should be separated and clarified.

3. Methods - section on purposive sampling (page 5):
It is good that the purposive sampling is further explained. It is not clear however how "experience" is defined - e.g. by number of years at the facility?, age?, clinical education? etc. This would be helpful. Also this particular sentence could be revised for language).

4. Data collection instrument - paragraph one:
Capital letters for Population Council.

5. Discussion:
A very large section of the discussion is on the patient satisfaction results. There
is limited discussion on the facility and activity findings. A discussion on facility and activity findings could have been expanded with reference to other studies from the area referring to utilization patterns. References are cited in the article by Birmeta in the latest edition of BMC HSR (among others) Determinants of maternal health care utilization in Holeta town, central Ethiopia. Birmeta K, Dibaba Y, Woldeyohannes D
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In addition the discussion could benefit from a stronger link to discussions in and around the WHO guidelines themselves. See for instance Vogel et.al. Reproductive Health, Vol. 10 April 2013.

These are minor essential reviews that could be considered by the authors.
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