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Reviewer's report:

The article touches on a very important health issue in the African region, which is access to healthcare services for vulnerable children particularly those with disabilities. However, there are important issues which need to be addressed to improve the manuscript.

Major comments

Abstract
Page 1, line 13-14: Some of the articles used for this scoping review come from countries outside the east African subregion, e.g. Cote D'Ivoire and Nigeria (refer to line 27-36 under the Results section). Kindly revise this sentence.

Methods
Page 3, line 41-49: The selection of only countries in the region that spend less than $50 per capita defeats the purpose of the study or pre-empt the outcome because that itself is a barrier to access to healthcare not for CwDs but also the population. Inclusion of CwDs papers/articles from all the countries in the region would have provided a comprehensive view of the issue being studied. I kindly invite the authors to remove the inclusion criteria and broaden the scope of the review to cover other CwDs articles in the continent.

Results
I suggest that the authors move the main results of the study from Appendix to the Results section. I humbly request the authors to also refer to the article below for guidance on their presentation of the results.


The authors should discuss the results section in a coherent manner. The current presentation with too many subheadings of barriers and facilitators makes it repetitive and boring. I suggest they limit the subheadings to the 7 identified themes and describe the barriers and facilitators within them in an essay form.

Discussion
1. Page 15, line 55-59 and page 16, line 4-13: The authors discuss maternal and child health in general. Although they admitted in the paragraph, I suggest they focus their discussion mainly on CwDs.

2. Discussion on the facilitators is very limited. The authors can elaborate more on this.

3. The policy implications of the study findings are not clearly articulated. I invite the authors to clearly bring this out in the discussion or conclusion section.

Minor comments
The authors are kindly requested to review the entire manuscript for language. There are a number of omissions and grammatical errors, some of which are listed below:

Abstract
1. Page 1, line 10: Insert "healthcare" between "inadequate" and "professionals" and change "inflict these children on impoverishment" to "inflict these children with impoverishment"

2. Page 1, line 19: "….a final 21 articles were included in this review". This sentence conflicts with the one on line 22 that says "15 articles were included eventually based on the selection criteria". Kindly reconcile these numbers.

3. Page 1, line 25: change "…. include social stigma,…" to "….including social stigma,…"

4. Page 1, line 33: insert "the" before "..key facilitators.."

5. Page 11, line 6: insert "are" between "that" and "associated"

6. Page 13: line 1: insert "of" between "one" and "the"
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