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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: Aderaw Anteneh
Major Compulsory Revisions
Comment 1: “Add a paragraph in the last part of the discussion that summarizes the prevalence of diarrhea and the high difference between model and non-model families. Discuss your summary in the context of the area supporting it with different literatures; whenever you discuss a certain result “this might be…………” or “….probably……” is not enough. Support your argument (guess) with literatures. For example, if you say “education provides knowledge on the rules of hygiene…” It is not difficult to support this argument with different literatures so that your “guess” is “scientific”.”
Response 1: As suggested, we were tried to address the comment in the revised document.

Comment 2: “Nearly in all parts of your discussion you said “this is in line with……” or “this contradicts to…..” This was encouraging because you compared your result with other findings. After you state your results you said “this might be…………” or “….probably……” this was also good but the problem is most of your arguments are not supported by literatures.”
Response 2: it was corrected as suggested in the revised version of the paper.

Thank you, we hope you agree!
Regards