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Reviewer's report:

I wish to congratulate the authors on their work. The paper is well written and I only have some minor comments.

1. Methods: I am wondering if this study was performed with the intention to inform the Maternal Newborn and Child Health Programme (MNCH2) on possible implementation? Perhaps it would be worth to mention this if that is the case.

2. Methods: I commend the authors on being so thorough with the description of the variables. Perhaps this section could be shortened.

3. Result: In the results the two states are compared as two groups, with significant differences between the groups, however I am unsure what the purpose of comparison was. Is this because the current study is a baseline study? The current study is a descriptive study and therefore I don't see the need for providing p-values for these two groups, table 1 and 2. The following table the two states are combined and the ultimate findings reflect on the variables such as education, wealth as predictable factors, not place of residence as a variable in itself. Although Table 4 has Kaduna as a category in the table, which I also do not fully understand.

4. Discussion: The findings of the study do not reveal something new necessarily and I wonder if the authors can be more clear about the added value of their study, or the importance for their particular site, setting. It would help to have a clear idea of the purpose behind the current objectives.

5. Discussion: The discussion does not have any limitation section.

6. Discussion: P16 line 5-12 seems unnecessary here.

7. Overall: The decision to choose for the difference between the ANC question vs the Birth question is not entirely clear to me. Wont delivering at a health facility also reduce the risk of complication too? The question for ANC - what are some things that a woman can do to reduce the risk of complications in pregnancy and childbirth. - keeps it open for interpretation. I am not sure why the authors didn't focus on the question - why ANC is important during pregnancy -. I
know this cannot be changed, but it puzzles me slightly that these two questions were asked so differently. One very clear and focussed, easy to understand. Less room for interpretation, while the ANC question remains rather vague. Was this really asked?

8. Overall: Both in the introduction and in particular in the conclusion the authors mention the word Empowerment and I am not sure this is the right word to choose in any of these contexts. It is use rather loosely while it in fact is a complicated term. Can the authors rephrase? Be more clear on what they actually want to say?

9. Conclusion: The conclusion is going slightly further than the rest of the paper, in terms of providing recommendations. It would help if the purpose to do this study becomes more clear see point 4. Also it would be useful, if the authors could analyse their findings and its relevance slightly more in relation to the global discussion on male involvement, see also the WHO recommendation from 2015.
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