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Mae Sot, 30 April 2011

To the BioMed Central Editorial Team of the “BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth”

Please find below our reply to the reviewers for the submitted article entitled:

“Improved pregnancy outcome despite low literacy on the Thai-Burmese border: results of three cross-sectional surveys” (MS ID: 7421025504836686)

We thank the reviewers for their suggestions for this manuscript. Referee 2 had no further revisions or modifications to discuss.

Referee 1:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The authors may still wish to take a critical look at their paper and remove any discrepancies and repetitions.
   We have reviewed the paper and removed discrepancies and repetitions as suggested.

2. In the background section, the authors may wish to include references to relationship between literacy level and pregnancy outcome, particularly with regard to impact of health education messages among literate and illiterate mothers.
   We have added some references in the subject as recommended.

3. In the methods section, explanation of the logistic regression models is insufficient. Please describe your models in some details (which was the dependant variable).
   We have completed the description of the logistic regression models (see statistical analysis section and results section).

4. The tables are also not very clear about which one is the dependant variable.
   We have modified the headings of the tables to clarify this.
5. In table 1, please indicate that numbers in brackets are percentage, or mean +/- SD and range in brackets.
   We have inverted the number and percentage in table 1 (now numbers are in brackets) in order to get the same pattern than table 3 and we have completed the footnote explaining the different variables.

6. In table 2, and also in the text, please provide which variables were included in the model to arrive at the AOR.
   All variables evaluated in univariate analysis were included in the table 2; as it happened all were significantly associated with the ability to read at a p value < 0.05 (explained in footnote) and thus were entered in the logistic regression model. We have clarified this in the text and in the footnote of the table 2.

7. Table 2 gives the likelihood of being literate in different risk categories. Commonly the likelihood of having malaria/anemia among literate/illiterate would be more meaningful.
   We may have approached this table in a somewhat unorthodox manner but we were interested in what habits or factors were associated with literacy in this population. It is important to identify these as some relate also to birth weight and are used later in the regression of risk factors associated with low birth weight. We have not inverted the table to look at the likelihood of having malaria/anaemia among literate/illiterate – this can be gained intuitively from the current proportions.

8. In table 4, please provide a list of variables included in the model to arrive at the AOR.
   All variables evaluated in univariate analysis were included in the table 4; all variables with a p value < 0.1 in univariate analysis were included in the regression model. We have clarified this in the text and in the footnote of the table 4.

9. Needs some language corrections before being published.
   Extensive proof-reading has been done during the first revision at the request of referee 2; we have reviewed the text and corrected the English language as much as we could and referee 2 has accepted the modifications. Without more direct comments on what needs correcting we are at a loss to know what to correct.