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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript by Vandy and co-authors. Overall, the manuscript tackled an important aspect of public health significance. However, it requires some major revisions to be accepted for publication.

Abstract

1) In the introduction section there is need to address the following

a. the opening statement (About 25%...) does not transmit the same meaning a similar stamen made on page 3 line 33.

b. What was the previous IPTp-SP policy?

2) In the methods section, I urge the authors to state how the women were selected and what criteria was used to selected the four study sites.

Background

1. Generally the background has a good number of one-sentence-paragraphs that do not make reading smoot. E.g. page 4, lines 3-6 and lines 48-50, page 5 lines 21-23 and line 39. This needs to be reviewed to enable information flow from one paragraph to the next.

2. Page 3, Paragraph 2, line 18 needs to be referenced

3. The paragraph starting with (Malaria in pregnancy … page 3 line 33 could be merged with the paragraph beginning (About 25 million…. Line 43) and reworded to flow.


5. Page 4 lines 10-17 needs to be referenced. It is not clear to me what the authors mean by "severe complications of malaria in pregnancy is striking for women in their first and second pregnancy". In the same light line 43: it is not clear what the authors mean by "Prevention of malaria in pregnancy is as important as treatment".
6. Page 5 line 21-23, the sentence is hanging, it is not linked to the paragraph above or the one below.

7. Information on Ghana in the background should be provided in one piece. As presented, it does not paint a picture of the situation in Ghana. For instance Page 4 line 4 (studies in Ghana…) and Page 5 line 27-36 should be merged and reworked to give a complete picture.

8. Line 39: the sentence starting with (To date,… ), it is not clear to me what this means.

9. Thought the aim of the study is clearly stated in the abstract, it is not clearly stated in the background of the study. I urge the authors to review this to reflect what is written in the abstract. It is also important to state the time covered by this report in this section.

Methods

1. Page 6, Line 27: "A sample proportional to the size of the facility was used to determine the number of nursing mothers to be recruited from each of the 4 facilities based on the case load". I suggest the authors correct this.

2. Also, I urge the authors to explain how systematic random sampling was applied in selecting participants in this study.

3. It is importance to include the inclusion criteria for this study.

4. Did the authors retrospectively look at participants records at each of the health facilities? I think this document should be available at the facility and could provide more information on attendance and obstetric characteristics.

5. I will like to know whether there was any attempt to retrospectively investigate the availability of SP over the last 12 months for instance as this covers the time of the ANC in question. Were there SP stock-outs over the las 12 months? The fact that a facility does not have SP now does not mean it did not have during the ANC period under consideration.

Results

1. SP is to be taken under the direct supervision of the health workers. The four participants who did not take SP should constitute and important finding. Was it due to refusal, stock-outs or what was the reason for not taking the SP. Did these women attend ANC at all?

2. Page 12 line 32-37: Is it normal practice that some participants received more or fewer tablets of SP? Or this could be a reflection that some of the nurses do not know what SP does to give?

3. Page 15: It is not clear what the authors mean by "fair/average knowledge about malaria and malaria in pregnancy". I suggest the authors review this statement.
Discussion

4. Page 18 line 46-53 needs to be reviewed.

5. Page 19, line 4-9, it is important to include the fact that the national health insurance scheme offers services only to registered members.

6. The authors should provide reference for some of the literature cited in the discussion.

Conclusion

7. The conclusion needs to be clearly written and focused

8. It is important to proof read the entire manuscript.
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