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To: Public Health Journal, Editorial Board

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Please find the revised manuscript entitled "Predictors of Oral Rehydration Therapy use among under-five children with acute diarrhea in Eastern Ethiopia: community based study."

We kindly thank you and reviewers for the useful comments. We have now improved the manuscript based on the comments.

We look forward to your feedback to the revised manuscript.

Best regards,

Bezatu Mengistie, also on behalf of the co-authors

Department of Public Health
Haramaya University
P.O.Box 235, Harar
Ethiopia

Email: bezex2000@yahoo.com or bezatum@gmail.com
Responses to Reviewers

We thank the reviewers for their useful comments. We have addressed them and append a detailed response to each of the comments.

Best regards,

Bezatu Mengistie, also on behalf of the co-authors.

Reviewer #1
The first reviewer satisfied with the previous response. There is no any other comment or question this time. Thank you for your contribution

Reviewer #2
We would like to thank you for the comments. All the comments are addressed
1. The term ‘caretaker’ is still present in several places in the manuscript. Use find and replace tool to make sure all occurrences of the term are changed.
   Response: Thank you. Done. The word ‘caretaker’ is replaced by ‘caregiver’ throughout the document.

Methods
1. Second paragraph: what is the rationale to take OR of 1.74 in the calculation of sample size? Indicate in the manuscript.

   Response: Done. It is read in the main body of the manuscript as ‘... proportion of caregivers educated (exposure) among the controls to be 33.7% and detecting 1.74 times higher educated caregivers among the cases ....’ The calculation was done based on EDHS 2005. Percent of exposure among the cases was 46.9% and expected frequency of exposure in controls group was 33.7% which gave odds ratio of 1.74. It was calculated using Epi Info.

2. Eighth paragraph: You have replied to the comment regarding use of mean score as cut off point by stating that the mean is appropriate for data that is normally distributed. You are right,
the mean is preferred for summarizing normally distributed data. But the comment was not about summarizing the data but about categorizing the data into two or more groups. If the distribution of knowledge score is unimodal you have categorize the data into three as ‘poor/low level’, ‘moderate’ and ‘good/high level’.

Response: Sorry for the misunderstanding of your comment. The distribution of the knowledge score is bimodal. The data is categorized in to two.

3. The paragraph before the last: rather than standard error compute variance inflation factor which is an indicator of how much of the inflation of the standard error could be caused by collinearity.

Response: Thank you for your valid comment. As you know high value of the standard error indicates the multicollinearity of the variables. In our data standard errors of the independent variables were very low, that is why we didn’t calculate the VIF or Tolerance. But now as per your comment we have calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) for the variables and found within the range of 1.045 and 1.58. According to literatures VIF less 10 not considered as serious. Recommended maximum value of 4 can be found in literatures. In our case VIF is smaller the recommended value. We have included this information in the main body of the manuscript.

Results
4. First paragraph, third statement: the comment given on the previous version of the manuscript is not accommodated. You cannot simply put numbers after the noun which they describe. You should restate the expressions in such a way that the number precedes the noun it refers to or use translational words like ‘account for’ ‘comprise of’. Revise the whole results accordingly.

Response: Thank you. Done accordingly to your comment

Discussion
5. The paragraph before the last one: the explanation given in last statement for the inconsistency of findings regarding association with educational status is not convincing. As long as valid
statistical tests are computed in comparing the proportions, the higher proportion of illiterate caregivers couldn’t be a reason for absence of association in this study but not in others.

Response: Our finding is consistent with one study but inconsistent with others. We thought that the last sentence might be a justification for the inconsistency. Based on your comment, we have deleted the justification.