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We are very grateful for the very constructive and valuable comments both reviewers furnished us. We have taken due consideration of the comments provided and made all necessary revisions to the manuscript. We have provided a point-by-point response to the comments hereunder.

Response to Bukola Fawole

Major compulsory revisions

Comment: Please report in the past tense.
Authors' response: We have revised the tense in which the manuscript is written.

Comment: Under Study setting, Authors employed the terms ‘different level clinics’, ‘different level private clinics’. Are these terms applicable only in Ethiopia? Do they correspond to primary care, secondary or tertiary health facilities? Similarly, ‘hospital level’, health centre level’ are not standard terms. Authors must use appropriate terminology.
Authors' response: We have extensively edited those terms as per the comment. We removed the term 'level' and used standard terms like hospitals and health centres throughout the manuscript.
Comment: Odds Ratio is usually reported in combination with the Confidence Interval (usually 95% CI) as used in the Tables. Authors need to report as such in the Results section too.

Authors’ response: We have revised the whole manuscript and included the comment. We have reported Odds Ratio in combination with confidence interval (95% CI) in the text as in the tables.

Comment: Being Nurse compared to Medical Doctor/previous training on partograph: Authors need to interpret these results. What are their effects on knowledge? The same applies to the bivariate and multivariate logistic regression. Authors need to discuss these findings with regard to whether ‘working at hospital’, ‘level of training’, ‘previous training’, and ‘perception of obstetric care givers’ etc led to significantly higher utilization of the partograph or not. In other words, it is not enough to report the findings as significant associations. It is crucial to describe the direction of the association.

Authors’ response: We have interpreted the results of significant associations as per the comment both in bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis. We also described the direction of the association among the variables in the manuscript.

Comment: What information do Authors intend to convey in Table 3? The title needs to be revised. Is it proportion or percentage of respondents who correctly identified components of labour assessment? It is essential to discuss any limitations of the study.

Authors’ response: It is the proportion of obstetric care givers who correctly identified the components of labour assessment. We have revised the title of table 3. We have also discussed the limitations of this study at the end of the discussion section before the conclusions.

Comment: The entire manuscript requires major language revision.

Authors’ response: We have extensively edited the language in which the manuscript is written giving due emphasis to the grammar and mechanics.

Minor Essential Revisions
Comment: Under Introduction: (Last paragraph) ‘Therefore, the objective of this study...........in the public health institutions’. Authors need to state among which category of people.

Authors' response: It is among obstetric care givers and we have revised and included this in the text.

Comment: The total number of hospitals in Addis Ababa was reported as 48 in Study setting and as 45 elsewhere.

Authors' response: The total numbers of hospitals in Addis Ababa are 48 hospitals (13 public health hospitals, 2 NGO hospitals and 33 private hospitals). This is reported under study setting. But under sampling method we have reported 45 public health institutions (13 hospitals and 32 health centres). We have not reported 45 hospitals and we have given some clarification about 45 public health institutions under sampling method in this revised manuscript.

Comment: For all mean values reported, Authors need to include their Standard deviations.

Authors' response: We have included standard deviations for all mean values reported under the ‘Result’ section as per the comment.

Comment: Under ‘Awareness and knowledge of the partograph among obstetric care givers: ‘Only 161 (82.6%) respondents could explain the function of action while...........’ Apparently ‘line’ is missing.

Authors' response: Thank you. We have included it accordingly.

Comment: Page 14 (Second paragraph, last sentence): ‘Moreover, 67 (34.4%) respondents agree with the view .........’ is confusing and ambiguous.

Authors' response: We have thoroughly revised the stated paragraph. Now we feel that it is no more confusing and ambiguous to readers.
**Comment:** Authors may limit OR and CI to 2 decimal points.

**Authors' response:** We have revised it accordingly. We have limited OR and CI to 2 decimal points both in the tables and in the text.

**Comment:** The second sentence under Discussion seems unclear.

**Authors' response:** We have omitted that sentence and revised the other sentences in the paragraph to help clarify the message being conveyed.

**Comment:** Page 19 (Second paragraph): ‘This may be due to the fact that at health centre............most of the hospitals in this study are referral hospitals .......’. This is at variance with the reported 5 public hospitals and 25 health centres that participated in the study.

**Authors' response:** We have grossly revised that sentence.

**Discretionary Revisions**

**Comment:** Authors need to employ a uniform writing style e.g. Midwives, Nurses, Doctors/midwives, nurses, doctors.

**Authors' response:** We have employed a uniform writing style using lower cases for the first letters for midwives, nurses, doctors, etc other than in places where these words appear at the beginning of a sentence.

**Comment:** Use capitals for the first letters of Addis Ababa University College of .......... Review Dareselaam.

**Authors' response:** We have made the necessary capitalization. We also revised ‘Dareselaam’ as ‘Dar es Salaam’.
Response to Matthews Mathai

Major compulsory revisions:

Comment: The sampling method needs more explanation – the initial part refers to calculation of sample size for the cross sectional study and the last paragraph refers to proportional allocation to the institutions. The steps in between are not clear. How were the samples proportionately allocated?

Authors’ response: We have made revisions as per the comment. We have included brief details of the sampling procedure to clarify the description of the sampling method.

Comment: The authors have adapted a questionnaire from a study in Nigeria. The questionnaire used in this study is not available for review and therefore it is difficult to know how utilization of the partograph was assessed. Was there any attempt to verify self-reported use of the partograph with clinical records?

Authors’ response: We didn’t submit the questionnaire with the manuscript because the journal doesn’t require authors to submit their questionnaires with manuscript. The results we reported on the use of the partograph is based totally on the respondents’ self-report. We didn’t verify their responses using clinical records. However, we also have collected data from partographs that have been used for monitoring mothers in labour. But that is intended to answer a totally different question—whether or not the partographs that are used to monitor labour are used to the standard. As such, that data cannot help us as a cross-check for self-reported use of the partograph. We will soon have another manuscript based on the findings of our assessment of partographs that are used for monitoring mothers in labour.

Comment: Table 6: Odds ratios as calculated suggest incorrectly that utilization was more in hospitals and by those who had undergone training and liked the partograph. These should be the other way around.

Authors’ response: Thank you for pointing this. We have corrected the way the odds ratios are calculated as per the comment.
Minor revisions:

Comment: It is also unclear which version of partograph was used in these hospitals.
Authors’ response: WHO modified partograph was used in the public health institutions (both in hospitals and health centres). We have indicated this version (modified WHO partograph) of the partograph was used in the public health institutions under the sub-title “utilizations of the partograph among obstetric care givers in the public health institutions”.

Comment: The global maternal mortality estimates should be updated using data for 2010.
Authors’ response: We have updated and revised the global maternal estimates using data for 2010.

Comment: The terms “partogram” and “partograph” are used interchangeably. Most WHO documents use “partograph”.
Authors’ response: We have changed the term “partogram” in the manuscript to “partograph” as most of the WHO documents use “partograph”.

Comment: The results from the WHO multi-country study are cited but the citation refers to the Cochrane systematic review (a more recent version is available) which does not include the WHO study results. Also the WHO study reported a 3% reduction in labour lasting < 18 h.
Authors’ response: We have revised the paragraph very carefully and used data from the Cochrane systematic review. We have used WHO study results from this reference by omitting the incorrectly used study results and we have revised it as per the comment.

Comment: The geographical coordinates of Addis Ababa do not appear correctly in the text. In any case, these are of little relevance to the report.
Authors' response: We have revised the geographical coordinates of the Addis Ababa as per the comment.

Comment: Pg 14, second para “About 117 (60.0%)… “is unclear. 
Authors' response: We have made a thorough clarification of this paragraph giving due attention to the wording of the sentences and the message intended to be conveyed.

Comment: There was more reported use of the partograph in health centres when compared to hospitals. While it is true that all health facilities providing childbirth care should use the partograph, finding 68% use at the peripheral level should be a good reason for celebration! If peripheral facilities use the partograph regularly to identify abnormal labour patterns early and arrange for timely referral to higher centres, one should expect a reduction in the current burden of morbidity related to prolonged and obstructed labour.
Authors' response: Thank you. We have used this comment in the discussion part in order to help clarify the idea presented when we compare reported use of partograph among obstetric care givers between health centres and hospitals.

Comment: Check citations for accuracy, using latest references where available. 
Authors' response: We have checked for the accuracy of the references used and made some revision. We have also used latest references for some citations like estimate of maternal mortality trends.

Comment: In Table 1: It should be maternal pulse (not maternal pulse blood pressure) 
Authors' response: Thank you. We have revised it accordingly.