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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review the above document. The study is a systematic review and Meta-Analysis on pregnancy intention and use of antenatal care services around the world. It is an interesting original research and it contributes to knowledge. However, there are a few observations which will help to improve the quality of the work.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? Yes, it is appropriate.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? No, they included studies with different study designs.
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Yes,
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes,
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, but few issues to add in the discussion section.
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes,
7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, with minor corrections

Major and minor revisions are listed below

Title: - Suggested title should read “Does pregnancy intention influence use of antenatal care services? A systematic Review and Meta Analysis”

Abstract- Methods-Line 2- “Popline CINHAL” should not be put in abbreviation. Also, in Results: Line 2- (OR 1.42 with 95% CI, 1.27, 1.59) is not the usual way of reporting an effect size and it would have been better if read as (OR, 1.42; 95% CI, 1.27 to 1.59).
Different study designs: population based cross-sectional studies, cohort studies and case-control studies reported in English were included. It would have been better if the authors use studies with similar study designs, because, the Cochran collaboration suggests that mixing different studies with different study designs are like mixing oranges and apples. Meaning that different study designs have different assumptions and interpretations. So, I suggest to use similar study designs for importing into Meta-Analysis.

Data Analysis

The Authors used both fixed and random effect models to indicate the effect size despite the heterogeneity of the studies included in the Meta-Analysis. If this is a case it is better if reported only using the random effect models. Moreover, the results of the Q value for heterogeneity assessment and Funnel plots for publication bias were not clearly indicated.

Results

Use the usual ways of reporting the effect sizes (OR) consistently.

Discussions

The majorities of the studies included in the Meta-Analysis (18/32) were from the USA that could overwhelm the effect size, while the authors gave emphasis for developing counties. So it is ideal to indicate in the limitations.

References

Indicate those studies included into Meta-Analysis using Astrix (*) or some other identifiers

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.