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Reviewer's report:

The paper has been slightly improved but not all my comments have been carefully addressed. Specifically:

1. Although the original introductory section has been divided into two sections, the aim of the paper still appears too late. The aim of the paper should be stated at the end of the first section.

2. The aim of the paper should be well motivated. What is the exact contribution of the paper to our knowledge? How is the study different from previous studies, also those in Uganda? This should be explained directly before or after the aim of the paper.

3. The definition of the categories ideal, moderate and poor utilization is now clear.

But how did the authors deal with respondents who did not perfectly match any of these three categories? Was the assignment to a category simply based on the number of ANC visits? If yes, then the analysis is about the number of ANC visits, not about ideal, moderate and poor utilization.

4. The discussion is now more focused but I still think that the authors could do more on the interpretation of the results. The results are rather trivial, nothing surprising. Education, residence and wealth are the most important determinants of ideal ANC utilization. I would be surprised if this was not known before in Uganda.

5. Abbreviations are not properly introduced in the paper. The abbreviations should be explained the first time they appear in the text. For example ANC.

6. The text should be written in past or present tense. I will give now another example: “… the dependent variable will be assessed …” is clearly incorrect because the study is already carried out. The entire paper should be reviewed to account for this.

7. The response rate should be reported. How have the authors dealt with missing cases?

8. The text needs to be carefully copyedited.

9. It will be useful if the authors also provide revision notes explaining how have they addressed the comments. And if not addressed, why not?
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