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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. There is little literature review. The title is birth preparedness and complication readiness and factors associated. But I saw nothing about factors associated. There are also studies done in Ethiopia on this title. The authors have also to see these papers.
2. For the qualitative part, why you included only TBAs for interview and only women for FGD? This has to be justified.
3. There is no exclusion criteria set in this study. It should be there.
4. Please mention how you managed if a woman had birth in the last 12 months and if the infant had died. Is this woman included or excluded.
5. The operational definition you used for birth preparedness and complication readiness is not clear. Is the woman said prepared when she fulfil all the things you mentioned there or when she fulfil any one of the criteria you mentioned there?
6. How you classified respondents as knowledgeable or not knowledgeable is not clear. Make it clear please.
7. It is not clear for me why it is needed to include 60 years old women in FGD for birth preparedness and complication readiness.
8. Most things written in the result are not incongruent with the title. For example, the authors mentioned a lot about traditional practices.
9. How income was calculated should be mentioned in the methods section.
10. Have you assessed the issue of multicolinearity in Birth order and gravidity/parity?
11. Some comparisons are inappropriate. For example, the authors tried to compare factors associated with birth preparedness and complication readiness with factors associated with ANC.
12. The conclusion is not in line with the title. Nothing is written in the conclusion about birth preparedness and complication readiness.
13. The recommendations are not in line with the result. For example, training health extension workers on birth preparedness and complication readiness is not in line with the result. There is no finding in the result that could show training need for HEWs.
14. The statistical analysis needs revision. For example, on table 3, one of the cells has only 4 counts. It is not recommended to do regression when the number of counts in one cell is less than 5.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. It is good if the authors add something that show gap in the abstract. That means the reason why they are interested on the topic
2. 575 mothers were selected and data was obtained from 575 mothers but the response rate was 99%.
3. The last section of the result in the abstract is incomplete. Please make it complete.
4. The variables in table 2 are not knowledge variables. Please correct it.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The alignment of the papers is left. Please make the alignment justify

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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