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Dear Editor,

First of all on behalf of all authors, I would like to express my appreciation to both referees for their time in reviewing our manuscript. We are grateful for their constructive comments. We found the comments helpful in enriching our manuscript.

With this cover letter, I am sending our point to point reflection on the comments forwarded by the referees. In the attached files our reflection to each comment is indicated in italic.

On behalf of all authors,

Kind regards,

Araya Medhanyie
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Reviewer's report
Title: Knowledge and performance of the Ethiopian health extension workers on antenatal and delivery care: a cross sectional study
Version: 1 Date: 14 May 2012
Reviewer: Henriette Svarre S Nielsen

Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the possibility of reviewing this manuscript. I have not considered whether the format conform with the journals criteria. This is a clearly written manuscript on a very important subject. The study is a cross sectional study on the knowledge and performance of HEW using mobile phones for data collection.
Major
1. Is the data normally distributed to allow using the mean? If not please change to median.

Reflection- This only concerns the data on the number of births assisted, all other data is mostly in percentages. The data on the number of births is normally distributed. Although there are very few outliers, the distribution of the number of births gives a bell shaped curve around the mean.

2. The mean number of births assisted by HEWs was 5.8 births within six months. This sentence is not clear. Within six month a HEW assisted in 5.8 births in average?

Revision- To make this sentence more clear, we rephrased this sentence both in the abstract (page 2, paragraph 3, line 6) and result section (page 10, paragraph 2, line 3).

3. In discussion please add a sentence regarding 26.5% of eligible HEW not interviewed.

Revision- we explained this issue in the result section (page 11, paragraph 1, line 2 and 3) and discussion section (page 15, paragraph 1)

Minor revisions:
4. Page 2 line 3: Please change very little to few

Revision- we revised it accordingly (page 2, paragraph 1, and line 3).

5. Page 2 line 5: specially? Please describe instead HEW with a 1 year training in

Revision – we revised it accordingly. We removed the word “specially” and rephrased the sentence (page 2, paragraph 1, and line 4).

6. Page 3 line 6 Is favorable the right word? Could relevant or appropriate be more correct?

Revision– we replaced ‘favorable’ by ‘appropriate’ (page 3, paragraph 1, line 5)
7. Please use the abbreviation HEW consistently after definition

*Revision* - In this revised manuscript, we did accordingly and the abbreviation is used consistently.

8. Table 1. Full stop is used after some of the sentences not all. Please be consistent.

*Revision* – we avoided using full stop and now it is consistent (see table 1, page 21).

9. Table 1." HEWs that assisted at least one" please add birth after this sentence

*Revision* – we corrected accordingly (see table 1, page 21).

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field  
**Quality of written English:** Acceptable  
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.  
**Declaration of competing interests:**  
I declare that I have no competing interests
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Reviewer's report
Title: Knowledge and performance of the Ethiopian health extension workers on antenatal and delivery care: a cross sectional study
Version: 1 Date: 19 May 2012
Reviewer: Sudhakar Morankar

Reviewer's report:
1. Question posed: Research topic is very important as primary health care delivery is important for the countries where health services delivery are very poor.
2. Methods: It is not very clear which method is used for data collection—whether the questionnaire was printed and filled in or it was filled in asking questions from the mobile and filled in mobile and then data is imported data for analysis from mobile. Whether investigator filled in questionnaires personally interviewing face to face or on mobile phone talk. There is discrepancy writing about phone interviews in abstract and in main text it is mentioned paper questionnaire.

Revision- to make clearer on how we used mobile phone for data collection; we rephrased the sentences and paragraphs. In the revised manuscript see the data collection section under methods sections (page 7 and 8). We also left out the statement that states we used mobile phone for data collection from the abstract to avoid confusion. We chose to explain it in details in the methods section as it is difficult to give more explanation on the use of mobile phone for data collection in the abstract section.

Sampling procedure adopted to select 50 HEWs out of 68 HEWs is not detailed.

Reflection- we did not use a specific sampling technique. We aimed at including and interviewing all HEWs working in the three districts.
Revision- in this revised manuscript, we included additional explanation that reflects that our aim was to include all HEWs working in the three districts. (Page7, under the participants and sampling section)

195,000 – May be the population covered by 39 Health posts and not the patients.

Revision-we changed patients by population accordingly (Abstract: page 2, paragraph 2, line 1) and (Result section: page 10, paragraph 1, line 1)

3. Data: is adequately analyzed and used.
4. Manuscript adherence: yes
5. Discussions and conclusions: They are adequately based on data.
6. Title and abstract: yes
7. Writing: English needs refining

Reflection- This revised manuscript is proofread by English native speaker and revised accordingly. The revisions we made were very minor.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests