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Dear Editor


Thanks for sending to me the reviewers’ comments. I have responded to them as follows:

Reviewer 1: Stephen Rulisa

1. The reviewer raised the issue of how midwives were nice and how this was studied. The training of midwives and how this was evaluated has been clarified in the methods section and highlighted.

1. Access to the two doses of IPTp in the study area has now been included under the method section, sub-section study area and population.

2. We feel the title is clear so we have not changed it

Reviewer 2: Daudi Simba

1. The reviewer raised the following issues: that the rationale for the study was not stated and it was not clear whether the policy in Uganda allows for free delivery of services or not. The reason for not women accessing the commodities, then the issue of feasibility and sustainability of the package.

   Response: The rationale of the study, the aim and the hypotheses were initially stated in the manuscript but now highlighted for clarity in the last but one paragraph of the introduction section.

   The reasons for women not accessing the commodities are given in the second paragraph of the introduction section.

   The policy on whether the services are provided free or not is given under the methods section, sub-section study population.

2. The authors didn’t clearly state the criteria for “intervention” and “non intervention” How the package was implemented, who were the providers, the recipients and how the package was implemented.

   Response: Under the section study design, it was clearly stated that midwives in two health facilities were trained to deliver the package to pregnant women attending routine antenatal care. This information is clearly highlighted in red.

3. The reviewer noted as an intervention, the primary and secondary outcomes should have been stated.

   Response: This had been stated in the last paragraphs of the introduction and under the study design that the aim of the study was to increases adherence to the two doses of SP
and for women to deliver at health facilities. The sections have now been reviewed and the primary outcome stated and highlighted.

4. Sampling procedure was not stated.  
   **Response:** The sampling was initially stated that all pregnant women who consented to the study and were in the second trimester were included in the study. This section has been reviewed to highlight inclusion criteria.

5. Authors didn’t state the study population, and the percentage of ANC.  
   **Response:** The study population was initially stated as all pregnant women attending routine ANC. ANC attendance in the study areas and other health indicators have been provided and highlighted.

6. The findings from the multivariate model are not reported in the results section.  
   **Response:** The results of the multivariate model were initially reported in the results section under sub-section client satisfaction. The results were also shown in table 5. These are now highlighted for clarity.

7. Table 3 and 4 has missing data.  
   **Response:** Indeed the missing data were indicated on certain variables. In table 3, the variable “who accompanied the pregnant woman” the denominator included missing data and this has been corrected and highlighted. Further, in table 3, the variable “what did you like in this study”; these were open responses which were manually analyzed and coded. In such a case would not expect the total to be 384. Thus this is not missing data. Similarly for table 4.

8. Multiple responses were possible in table 3 and 4. All respondents provided a single response.  
   **Response:** This is not true, table 3 and 4 shows that respondents gave several reasons and recommendations of course varying in frequency. This is expected in interviews.

9. There are arithmetic errors in table for married women; it is reported as 80% instead of 79%.  
   **Response:** This has been corrected both in the results section and in the table.

Finally I would like to thank the reviewers for highlighting the issues. I found of them useful while revising the manuscript.

Anthony K Mbonye