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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for taking your time reviewing our manuscript. Thank you again for the valuable comments you gave to make our article publishable. Sorry for the late response, it is just because that things are beyond our control because of double responsibility and commitment we are having in our institution. I have tried to accommodate all the comments you forwarded and tried to indicate the already included comments. I have attached the revised manuscript and the track changed one. Thank you for being understanding and helpful.

Please try to strongly reduce your Introduction Section: I have reduced a paragraph.

2. Please delete the first sentence the paragraph remaining: “This study was designed to evaluate the prevalence of recto-vaginal colonization of GBS in pregnant mothers near term attending Ante Natal Clinics (ANC) in two teaching Hospital in Addis Ababa, identify associated risk factors and assess the antimicrobial sensitivity pattern of the isolates”. It is done.

In the email that we sent we suggested you how to better organize the Discussion section.

In this regard we suggested you the following:

Please follow this structure:

* statement of principal findings of the study. Summarise key results with reference to study objectives: I have included.
* strengths and weaknesses of the study: I have tried to show that
* strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies, discussing important differences in results and what your study adds. Whenever possible please discuss your study in the light of relevant systematic reviews and meta-analyses (eg Cochrane reviews). Done
* meaning of the study: possible explanations and implications for clinicians and policymakers and other researchers; how your study could promote better decisions. Was included already in the previous revised article
* unanswered questions and future research