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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well-written and interesting article. The research question is well defined and the methods are appropriate. This covers an important research topic and seeks to provide a practical answer that could improve progress towards the Millenium Goals.

I have no major compulsory revisions or minor essential revisions. However, I did find that in some places the report lacked clarity, or could have expanded on what was mentioned. To this end, I have some discretionary revisions for the authors:

1) The background could mention more about the alternatives for umbilical cord care for neonates (five are mentioned much later on in the paper). To aid the description of how important the research is, a few sentences on why this particular preparation of antiseptic would improve neonatal survival, would be useful.

2) The sample size calculation is looking at a 10% difference in the proportion of WTP for chlorhexidine products between the women and their husbands, but husband and wife values are never compared. Husband and wife values are likely also not independent of each other, though this assumption is not explored in any way and the rationale for interviewing couples separately is not described. In any case, I would certainly how that 1717 individuals is a sufficiently large sample for rural Bangladesh though I am not sure of the demographics there, but the sample size calculation seems a bit vague, or the justification for it seems strange to me.

3) The fifth paragraph of the methods section says that cross-matches for respondents' positive responses were made between the prefixed prices and independently reported maximum price for all three products, and yet in the results section the cross-matching results are only reported for the multi-dose liquid and I can't find a reason why the results for the other two products are not also reported.

4) It would be useful to have a Figure/Table (possibly in an online supplementary table if necessary) with the script for the interview in terms of the description of the products provided to participants. Particularly given the information on preference for gel rather than liquid - information on how the product was
described may indicate why they might have preferred this.

5) The results for each of the products say that X% were willing to pay the prefixed prices but doesn't specify whether this is at least one of the prefixed prices/the lowest prefixed price/ all the prefixed prices etc etc.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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