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To

The Chief Editor

BMC Women’s Health

Subject: Submission of revised manuscript “Factor associated with the utilisation of postnatal care services among the mothers of Nepal: Analysis of Nepal Demographic and Health Survey 2011”

Dear Chief Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit the third revised version of our manuscript. On behalf of my co-authors, please find attached our revised manuscript of an original article entitled “Factor associated with the utilisation of postnatal care services among the mothers of Nepal: Analysis of Nepal Demographic and Health Survey 2011.” We have provided a point to point response to the reviewers’ concerns and made a number of revisions as appropriate. I have attached a summary of these revisions. We would like to thank you and the reviewers for your time and allowing us to resubmit manuscript for further review.

Sincerely yours,

Vishnu KHANAL

Email: Khanal.vishnu@gmail.com
Response to the reviewers’ comments

We would like to thank reviewers for their thoughtful comments and valuable time for improving our manuscript. The followings are the point by point response to the issues raised by the reviewers.

Reviewer 1: Christiana Titaley

I thank authors for responding carefully to each comment given by all reviewers. Some minor issues that authors might want to incorporate in the final manuscript:

Authors stated that in Methods Section that "... attendance during delivery, timing of antenatal care and birth order were left out of the model." In fact, these variables were not completely left out, but authors have entered them in a separate model. Authors might want to state this in the Methods.

Authors’ response:
We have revised this accordingly. (Statistical analyses, the last sentence).

It is mentioned that "richer families are also more likely to have achieved higher education...." Education variable has been controlled in the model when assessing the relationship between use of postnatal care and household wealth index and thereby can no longer be a potential reason for this relationship.

Authors’ response: (Page 13, the last paragraph of discussion section)
We have revised it accordingly and highlighted the changes made.
Reviewer 2: David Doku

In response to my comment regarding elaborating on the use of Complex Simple Analysis Procedure to address cluster sampling, the authors mentioned “We have included a more detailed description of how Complex Simple Analysis was used to address the issue of cluster sampling.”, but I did not see this in the method section contrary to their claim.

Authors’ response: Page 7, Paragraph 1,

All the analyses were performed using Complex Sample Analysis procedure which was deemed necessary to adjust for sample weight, and multi stage sampling. An analysis plan was prepared using strata, cluster and sample weights. This plan file was used while performing Complex Sample Analysis to achieve a more precise point and period estimation.

I did not see how the results and consequently the discussion were revised based on the new Table 2.

Authors’ response:

In previous revisions, the other reviewer raised concern of the inclusion of maternal age and birth order in the same model. In the revision, we responded: “We checked collinearity between mother’s age and birth order and found that they were highly correlated (r = 0.85)”. This led us to re-analyse all regression models included in the manuscript. The new models are presented in Table 2.

The current results section, presents the revised findings of the factors associated with postnatal care (Table 2). Because all the odds ratios and their 95% CIs were changed, we did not highlight specific changes. This may be the reason that the reviewer did not notice changes in writing. Please note that the current revised version does not contain the discussion on mother’s age and birth order which is based on the findings suggested by Table 2.
Page 11, Conflicting time schedule is a better explanation so delete the phrase, “This heavy workload in combination with”.

Authors’ response: Page 13. Paragraph 2:
We have revised it as:

This conflicting time schedules may provide an explanation for the decreased likelihood of postnatal care attendance among mothers reporting agricultural occupation.

Page 13, last paragraph of the discussion section. Replace “rich households” with “higher socioeconomic households”.

Authors’ response: We have revised it accordingly (Page 13; the last paragraph of discussion section)

Still minor language editing is needed, especially in the Public health implication section.

Authors’ response:
Thank you for your comments, we have revised the manuscript and addressed language where required.