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Reviewer's Comments
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript entitled Barriers and Facilitators to Healthcare Access for Children with Disabilities in the Sub- Saharan African Countries: A Scoping Review. The findings can be of interest for sub-Saharan countries in which access to health service is a major problem in the population in general, and in children with disabilities in particular. However, the following issues are to be addressed in order to improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. To be begin, in this kind of review or the terms used to search for the evidences in the data sources are very important. Different terms with the same meaning can be used in different setting by different scholars. However, in this manuscript, the authors did not clearly state how they searched for evidences, and what terms they used. For example, the term barriers can have other similar terms such as obstacles, and the term facilitators can be used as enablers. The same is true for the terms children, disabilities, etc. Please make these things clear.

Abstract
2. The objective in the abstract section does not go with what was written in the background. In the background, the main focus seems Ethiopia. Here, the focus seems selected low to middle income East African countries. This is also no in line with sub-Saharan countries described in the method and result section.

Background
3. The authors tried to convince the readers by stating some of the issues related to children with disabilities. However, the argument lacks synthesis of evidences. The authors reported the findings of individual study. It would have been better if they had search for more evidences, comprehended, and synthesized them.

Methods:
1. How did you conduct the scoping review? Did you standard manual such as the Joanna Briggs Methods Manual for Scoping Reviews?
2. Did you use a protocol? If so, please specify it.
3. Did you use PRISMA? If so, how?
4. The authors could use the following sub-headings under the methods section:
Data sources and search
Study selection: inclusion criteria
Study selection: screening
Data abstraction
Data charting and collation
Consultation


Results
5. In reporting the results, it would have been good if the authors had reported all the facilitators or barriers. The presentation of facilitators and barriers for each theme may not be attractive for readers.
6. Please also check the comments given in track changes (highlighted in yellow color) in the main document.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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