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Victorino Silvestre
Journal Editorial Office
Bio Med Central

Dear Sir,

Re: Response to Fourth Reviewer’s Comments: Manuscript No: MS: 3200679471026039
Thank you for the communication dated September 12th, 2014 concerning reviewers’ comments.

We would like to thank the reviewer for the excellent comments that have enabled us improve the manuscript. Please find below a point-by-point response to the comments

Reviewers’ Comments:

Dr Ingunn Engebretsen

Major

1. “Older children are less wasted because – stunting sets in – in other words – younger children are more wasted. That impairs length growth. So – sentence should be rephrased to express risk of wasting at younger ages followed by I guess (check your data) stunting at older ages.”

This has been rephrased as advised and data represented that way in the table section.

2. “In the discussion you write” Children less than 25 months were more likely to be wasted in relation to a known vulnerability for diseases and death in this age group and longer term chronic under nutrition.” This first part of the sentence fits well to your results and are well formulated. Having a cross-sectional design inhibits you from knowing the temporal development of this condition with time.”
The sentence has been modified to read “Children less than 25 months were more likely to be wasted; this is probably due to the possibility of a higher infectious disease burden in this age group in this particular region.”

Minor

1. “A trained reader doesn’t need significant findings in bold”

These have been unbolded.

2. “This is your main finding! We found a low level of overall knowledge of the C-IMCI of 13.3% (n=59). This is well reflected in your final conclusion. Could also be the first point in your abstract conclusion.”

This has been put.

3. “The authors can polish the table tests and tables more.”

This has been rectified.

4. “Table 4: Only the positive data (“yes” column) needs to be presented. The editor can also advice on their preferred style.”

This has been addressed.

5. “Create paragraph where you start discussing strength and weaknesses.”

This has been addressed.

6. Rewrite: “However there is a need for public health for interventions to reduce the knowledge gap.” I suggest you rewrite and say that «we recommend….»

This has been addressed to read “We recommend public health interventions to reduce the knowledge gap.”

7. “Undernutrition can be written in one word (even if the word-spell-check tells us something else)”

This has been changed.

8. “Space is missing before brackets. Xyz [n] instead of wyz[n] or even spaces in excess, see 16.”
These have been rectified.

9. “Background: the statement on C-IMCIs potential to improve mortality needs to be backed-up by a respected reference. If not the sentence needs to be moderated into what we actually know with certainty.”

The sentence has been moderated to read “C-IMCI was postulated……”

We hope you will find our responses adequate.

Yours faithfully,

Mukunya David.