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Review report for the manuscript entitled "Delayed initiation of Antenatal Care and Associated Factors in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis" Delayed initiation of Antenatal Care and Associated Factors in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis"

This systematic review intends to estimate the pooled effects of various factors that were reported to be associated with the delayed initiation of antenatal care in Ethiopia. Generally I think this attempt is commendable and suitable for the journal readership. But I have a couple of comments on the methods.

1. Evidence quality should be rigorously evaluated in the process of a typical systematic review. Normally, 6 frameworks are preferred (see Luoto, 2013 Plos Medicine)-GRADE, HASTE for example.

2. The authors mentioned the three delay model, which is a useful framework. However, the authors failed to incorporate it into their analysis. Should I were you, I would classify all the factors according to the framework, in order to streamline the analysis.

3. All the studies selected in the review are based on cross-sectional surveys, I am not convinced that the effects could be synthesized, even by a random effect model.

4. I would suggest the authors to clarify in table 1 which studies are based on DHS data. If many of them are DHS, systematic review should really be replaced by a pooled reanalysis of the original data.

5. Figure 3-8 is not clear, which are the reference groups? And these figures seems abundant. I would prefer to report the data in a table and move these Forest plot to appendices.
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