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Author's response to reviews

We were pleased to have an opportunity to revise our paper now entitled, “Risk Factors of Diarrhoeal Disease in Under-Five Children among Health Extension Model and Non-Model Families in Sheko District Rural Community, Southwest Ethiopia”. In revising the paper, we have carefully considered your comments and suggestions, as well as those of the reviewers. As instructed, we have attempted to succinctly explain changes made in reaction to all comments. After providing a brief overview of ways in which the paper was revised, we reply to each comment in point-by-point fashion.

We greatly appreciate your understanding regarding the resubmission deadline. Your and the reviewers’ comments were very helpful overall, and we are appreciative of such constructive feedback on our original submission. After addressing the issues raised, we feel the quality of the paper is much improved and hope you agree. The reviewers’ comments have been addressed as follows:

Reviewer 1: Aderaw Anteneh

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Comment 1: “In the introduction part state the health situation of under-five children in Ethiopia more clearly”.
Response: The introduction part is revised substantially

Comment 2: “……. the discussion lacks depth; the authors tried to discuss their results simply by comparing with other results. Though their motivation to compare with other previous results is a good effort; comparing the result with other previous studies and saying “consistent with….” Or “inconsistent with…..” Is not enough. The authors should try to justify why consistent with or why inconsistent with previous studies. Discussing a result is not only comparing with previous studies. Try to discuss your results more deeply and clearly based on the context of the study area…….”
Response: Discussion was updated as suggested.

Minor Essential Revisions

Comment: “Try to define local words like: kebele, dega, woyina dega, kola”
Response: the local words were defined as suggested.

Reviewer 2: Digsu Negese Koye

Minor essential revisions:
Comment 1: “Abstract result section: start by describing the sample size and some descriptive statistics”
Response: corrected as suggested.
Comment 2: “Result section of the abstract: The combined effect of being non-model families…, this sentence is incomplete.”
Response: The sentence is corrected and completed.
Comment 3: “Methods: To enhance reliability, questionnaire was adapted in English……, was it translated to English or adapted to English?”
Response: To enhance instrument reliability, the adapted questioner was translated in to local language Amharic and back translated in to English by another person.
Comment 4: “Methods: Grade 10+3 is diploma, correct it as diploma holders”
Response: The sentences were corrected.
Comment 5: “Results: Descriptive vs. analytic part; better if separately presented in the results section.”
Response: As suggested, Results: Descriptive part was separated.
Comment 6: “Page 8, first sentence mother/caregiver educing – correct it as education”
Response: the word type error is corrected as indicate.
Comment 7: “The word illiterate, it would be better if corrected as cannot read and write”
Response: As suggested, the word illiterate is replaced.
Comment 8: “Interpretation of the OR is not consistent for all significant variables”
Response: to make the interpretation consistent many substantial updated was made in the revised version of the paper.

Major compulsory revisions:
Comment 1: “Language editing: Revise language and grammar throughout the paper. The manuscript would be benefited if reviewed for language by a native speaker”
Response: The paper is checked again to improve its language and grammar.
Comment 2: “The conclusion in the abstract section is not a conclusion rather a recommendation?”
Response: As suggested, Conclusion is updated in the revised version of the paper.
Comment 3: **“Referencing:** the authors missed reference number 5 in the body of the introduction section. BMC has its own referencing style and the referencing style used in this manuscript is different from it. Please correct all the references accordingly.”

Response: As suggested, reference style is corrected and updated substantially with many new references in the revised version of the paper using “Zotero”.

Comment 4: **Methods section:** “What was the reason to add a design effect? Have you used cluster or multistage sampling technique? It is not indicated in the methods section?”

Response: to increase precision of the population estimate we used stratified simple random sampling and the reason to add a design effect was we take 50% of kebeles from each stratum and then we sampled the study units. This process has two units.

Comment 5: **Methods section:** “An adapted interviewer administered questioner was used to collect the data. Where was the source of the questionnaire? Have you adapt or adopt it?”

Response: the source was cited and it is adapted.

Comment 6: **Methods section:** Do you think that backward stepwise multiple logistic regression is appropriate to identify the determinants? I think the hierarchical logistic regression technique will be appropriate. It is because socioeconomic, environmental, water supply, and behavioural factors will not contribute in a similar manner. Socio-economic factors are distal factors and water supply and behavioural factors may act as proximal factors.”

Response: yes the suggestion is correct, but our interest is to see the effect of health extension programme on the predictors of childhood diarrhoea simultaneously than hierarchical and our sample is quite enough to run backward stepwise.

Comment 7: “Environmental and water supply related variables have to be collected by observation technique. Have you carried out observation or not? If not, how did you assess these variables? For example, how you assessed proper refuse disposal by the study participants and mother’s fingernail condition?”

Response: we use an observational data collection technique using checklist based on the prior sate definition.

Comment 8: “The study was carried out using interview technique but there was a high rate of non response rate? What was the reason for this much non response rate?”

Response: since our study area is cash crop area some of families during data collection are stay out home, but revisiting was made and reported as non response.

Comment 9: “The discussion section didn’t address the limitations of the study.”

Response: The discussion part is updated as suggested.
**Comment 10:** “Conclusion: soap use for hand washing was not significantly associated at table four (the final model) but the authors report it as a significant predictor for occurrence of childhood diarrhoea.”

**Response:** in table 4 soap use for hand washing was corrected as indicated.