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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is generally well written and addresses practical issues. But I agreed with the reviewer 1's comments and noted many of the comments can not be addressed in the current study. I think the authors have made a reasonable effort in addressing the comments. Minor comments are as the follows.

1. Please discuss about the findings "the result was no longer significant for women with severe overestimates (AOR=0.84, 95% CI: [0.69, 1.03]p=0.086)." The result remained significant for women with moderate overestimate, but not severe overestimate. Then how can you conclude "The overestimation of women's EDDs reduces the likelihood of health facility delivery?" How do you explain the differences between moderate and severe underestimation?

2. For the consideration of "preterm delivery," could you please conduct sensitivity analysis to confirm? Even though 42% of births as preterm was impossible, to certain extent, preterm is still something that could have confounded or biased your results.

3. The selection of cut-off for severe overestimate (35 days) is not clear.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
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.
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Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal