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Author’s response to reviews:

Guidelines
Point-by-point response to review comments
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes! The question and idea are completely new. I will suggest strengthening the introduction and review of literature. Second and third paragraphs after introduction only based on two literatures. Therefore suggestion is to build the study in this ground. Add few more literatures
Reference no 6, 7,8,9,10,11,13,15,18,30,31,32,33,37 don’t have volume number. (Minor Essential Revisions)

Response: The introduction has been revised as advised. Additional references have been added. Where they are available, volume numbers have been added to all references

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
For exit interview method is appropriate but need more description of the variables such as education level, marital status, Gravidity, Gestation age etc ((Major Compulsory Revisions)

Response: Details on the variables have been added in the Methods section
3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   It is suggested to describe little bit more on table 1 and 2 mainly giving more focused to
   objective. Statistical terminology are required to the description of table 3 and 4.
   Response: Details have been added on the results of Table 1 and 2

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the
data?
   Rework is needed in this regard; suggestion is to less emphasize the limitation and
   implementation in clear and single statement. (Major Compulsory Revisions)
   Response: The discussion has been appropriately revised

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Completely agree on this, background should be revised, since this study
   focused on the
   knowledge of danger sign and BP hence first line of the abstract should be clearer on this line (major change).
   Response: This has been done. The introduction and abstract have been revised.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes, idea and study design of this manuscript describe a technically sound piece of
   scientific research.
   Please make your report as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that
   authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find
   and please
   also divide your comments into the following categories:
   ## Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on
   publication can be reached)
   ## Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a
   term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

Reviewer's report
Title: Does knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy predict birth preparedness? A critique of the evidence from women admitted with pregnancy complications.
Version: 1 Date: 17 September 2014
Reviewer: Zia Ul Haq

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Participants and data collection:
• “Participants were women admitted to hospital from 20-36 weeks of gestation for complications of pregnancy.” Did the authors select all of the women admitted with complications or it was random selection? Need to be explained and justified here.

Response:
All pregnant women with obstetric complications were eligible for inclusion, and participants were consecutively recruited. This is because all women are at risk of pregnancy complications which risk may manifest in pregnancy, childbirth or postpartum.

• “Data was collected using the tool on monitoring birth preparedness from JHPIEGO [16] adapted to the local context.” Can the authors please add more detail about this tool and its validity? Information should also be added about its adaptation to the local context. Does it have any affect on the validity?

Response:
Whereas this tool is widely used in evaluating programs and services and in research, there is no information on its validity and reliability. It is also recommended that users evaluate its usefulness in different settings and contexts

• Is there any reference to support this definition of “knowledgeable”? “A woman who reported at least one danger sign in pregnancy, childbirth or postpartum period was considered to be ‘knowledgeable’ on danger signs.”

Response:
There is no standard definition on being knowledgeable about danger signs or birth preparedness
• Again is there any reference to support this definition of “knowledgeable” of BPCR? “We also asked about awareness components of BPCR. Women who mentioned at least three of the five basic component of BPCR were regarded as ‘knowledgeable’ on BPCR.”
Response:
There is no standard definition on being knowledgeable about danger signs or birth preparedness

Minor Essential Revisions
Introduction; last para: “Whether knowledge of danger signs translates into improved birth preparedness is not documented”. Is it true and whether it is in Uganada or worldwide?
Response:
There is no local data or data from a review of the literature where the concept of BPCR or tool/matrix of BPCR has been used, on whether knowledge of danger signs is associated with more birth preparedness and complication readiness

Methods:
First para: “This research was part of a post-doctoral research project........” It is already mentioned in acknowledgment and seems to me needless here
Response
This has been corrected

Study settings:
“There health care is provided by a variety of health care professionals......” Too much detail which may not be required here
Response
This has been corrected

Participants and data collection:
“socio-demographic characteristics (such as age, marital status...occupation,“ add closing bracket
Response
This has been corrected

Data analysis:
The dependent, independent and confounding variables should be mentioned clearly here.
Response
Results:
Last para “There was a statistically significant...” please, mention the adjusted OR, 95% CI and P-value

Response
This has been corrected

Discussion:
Para 1,line 2; Didn't understand “among women antepartum women”
It should be mentioned here that the participants were women admitted with pregnancy complications.
Response
This has been corrected

Discretionary Revisions
Para 3- last two sentences- mentioning ref 9 one time may be enough
Response
This has been corrected
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