Minor Essential Revisions

1. Sources
- Some data presented in the article lack sources. For example in line 320 with the title 'Normal delivery record review,' data was presented and the reader was referred to table 5. However, the data presented is not reflected in the table.
- Line 125 has no cited reference for the source of the population of Moroto district.
- In line 157, I believe the authors were referring to 'Taro Yamane?'
- In line 180, the statement 'where it was appropriate, 95% confidence intervals were calculated' was made with no reference to exact situations where they were actually calculated, and no reflection of the use of confidence intervals in the data presented.

2. As part of the limitations (line 457), the authors noted that while investigating services received, mothers were unable to accurately recollect if they ever received services. If this argument holds true, does this not undermine the premise of the data collected and used in the postnatal care exit interview?

Discretionary Revisions

1. Presentation of Data
The study yielded a lot of results which was presented in a slew of numbers and percentages. These can be difficult to follow. Perhaps, the authors can consider presenting the data in a more visual format, for example using tables in the results section, for ease of understanding.

2. The paper will benefit from a thorough grammatical review.
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