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Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to respond to the Dr. van Teijlingen’s comments on our manuscript entitled, “Health and nutrition knowledge, attitudes and practices of pregnant women attending and not-attending ANC clinics in Western Kenya: a cross-sectional analysis”.

In response to the Associate Editors insightful comments, please find below our detailed point-by-point responses that correspond to the revised manuscript attached.

Thank you again for considering this paper for publication. We look forward to your reply.

Sincerely, on behalf of the authors,

Nandita Perumal, MPH
Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto
155 College Street
Toronto, ON
Email: nandita.perumal@gmail.com
Dr. Edwin van Teijlingen’s comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Authors Response</th>
<th>Revision Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I was surprised you did not read / quote to the systematic review on ANC uptake: Simkhada, B. et al. (2008) Factors affecting the utilisation of antenatal care in developing countries: a systematic review of the literature, Journal of Advanced Nursing 61(3): 244-260.</td>
<td>We thank the Editor for this critical comment. We agree that the review by Simkhada et al. (2008) is relevant to our analysis. This review, in fact, summarizes clearly the individual and household-level covariates that confound the association between antenatal use and maternal nutrition and health knowledge, attitudes and practices. We have cited the review in the Methods section to strengthen our rationale for the covariates included in our conceptual framework, which is in the spirit of the Editor’s suggestion.</td>
<td>Page 10: Methods section (Independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The authors interchangeably use numbers and words to convey numbers in the text, for example in the two sequential sentences: “..less than 2 years of age. The survey was conducted in the catchment area of eight healthcare facilities..” I would suggest use words for numbers one to twelve and numbers for 13 and higher.</td>
<td>Thank you for bringing these discrepancies to our attention. As advised, we have changed the text such that numbers one through twelve are reported in words and counts 13 and higher are reported in numbers.</td>
<td>Pages 4, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Don’t start a sentence with a number. The sentence “2761 women” should read “A total of 2761 women...”</td>
<td>As recommended, we have modified the sentence as follows: “A total of 2761 women participated in the baseline survey, of which 1781 were mother-child pairs and 980 women were pregnant at the time of the survey”. Thank you for this observation.</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>