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Reviewer's report:

Reproductive healthcare utilization in urban poor settlements of Delhi: Baseline survey of ANCHUL 2 (Ante Natal and Child Health care in Urban Slums) project

General Comments
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The question looks well defined but should be rewritten.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Well described, logical and appropriate.
3. Are the data sound? Yes, very sound.
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Figures are genuine. No manipulation.
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Conclusion looks to be coherent with the data and discussion realistic.
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Good.
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, significantly.
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Reasonably but the methods should be recast according to earlier suggestion.
10. Is the writing acceptable? Acceptable for publication if all suggested corrections are adhered to.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors need to read the manuscript and correct the typos eg muslin on L206

-Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Abstract
L54 move household to after non-poor
Which statistical analyses method were used. The authors failed to mention any method. The abstract is too long….spanning two pages
Correct some typos and tenses eg L69

Background
L88 Recast
L107 Adhere to abbreviations after first use. UHC
L114 There is need to represent the statement problem and justification for the study L116 to L122 are methodologies and should be moved there

Method
L134 is not clear “catered to this district” Please recast
L146 The URLs are better referenced. Take to references
L152, phrase starting with written should be moved forward to L149.
L154-L156 Please remove…Unnecessary details.
L161-L163 Please remove…Unnecessary details.
Figure 1 is not adding value to the manuscript
A lot was said about sample size computation, but the actual sample size and its ultimate computation was not stated
L204 The published literature must be stated and properly referenced
L206 Typo muslin

Results
L222 –L224 is part of methodology and not findings. This should be moved and reworded appropriately
L225 Not presented properly. It should have been 630 HH has PW while 639 has RDM of which 600 PW and 605 RDM gave………
L228 Unnecessary clause
L232 Computation of MMR is far reaching and involving than the inputs provided by the authors. This estimate from a cross sectional study is obviously unreliable.
The result section is unnecessarily detailed. Most of the facts in Tables were presented. It should be rewritten to be concise.

Discussion
L290 what is the correct definition of ANC attendance or registration? What happens to those that has lost the cards. Although card is an evidence, it will be erroneous to classify non-card holders as unregistered. It should be those who attest by any means that they saw an ANC provider.

Tables and Figures
Table 1 is not informative. The contents should be converted to texts and inserted in the manuscript appropriately.
Table 3 and Table 4 can be merged.
Figure 1 should be removed.