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We were pleased to have an opportunity to revise our paper and we have greatly appreciated the reviewers’ comments and suggestions were very helpful overall. In revising the paper, we have carefully considered reviewers’ comments and suggestions on our revised submission. As instructed, we have attempted to succinctly explain changes made in reaction to all comments and we hope you agree. After providing a brief overview of ways in which the paper was revised, we reply to each comment in point-by-point fashion as follows:

Referee # 1
Major Compulsory Revisions
Comment 1: “1. In the previous document it was stated that the contribution of climate zone, availability of latrine,.............. are not associated with diarrhea and contrasted with other studies, in their discussion it was also stated that “This might be due their contribution to the occurrence of childhood diarrhoea was small in comparison to other variables”. Based on this I gave a comment that “why the contribution might be small compared with other variables?” However, in the present document I can’t find all these. You were not asked to delete it rather to discuss it deeply. Please try to address it accordingly.”
Response 1: As suggested, we were tried to address the comment in the revised paper in the last part of discussion.
Minor Essential Revisions
Comment 1: “The reference numbered [16] is in the reference list but I can't find it referred in the body of the document. Please check it”
Response 1: As suggested, it was corrected.

Referee # 2
Major compulsory revisions
Comment 1: “Language editing: still the document needs language edition by a native speaker or an expert.”
Response 1: As suggested, we were tried to edit the document language by expert.

Comment 2: “The author's said they have used “stratified multistage simple random sampling technique” but I never come up with such a sampling technique. Please check it again. I prefer multistage sampling technique.”
Response 2: corrected as suggested in the revised version of the paper.

Thank you, we hope you agree!