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Reviewer’s report:

While the study is highlighting an important issue of quality improvement interventions on perinatal outcomes, some parts of the paper need some clarifications.

1. Unclear geographical context of the study. As authors discussed about global phenomena in the beginning of the paper, in line 73-76 there was a mention of a specific region. Does this have any specific relevance that authors have not clearly depicted in the title or abstract? Otherwise, authors could increase the global relevance by citing literature/studies done in other regions in this section. Under Study setting - it seems to be the geographical context is more global. However, one would argue that country's economic development would intervene with the primary and secondary outcomes of the QI interventions.

2. There is unclarity between the knowledge gap extracted from the Abstract and from what is written in the last paragraph of the Introduction section (line 120-121). Authors may clarify in more specifics, whether their Systemic Review will cover on QI interventions targeted at macro, meso and micro-levels OR that the emphasis is on the QI interventions in macro, meso and micro-levels that were country-wise (wide? - line 120).
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