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Author's response to Editor: In the manuscript the new information were highlighted in yellow. See below for the response

Question: ##1 Please provide a power determination: chose a relevant comparison and explain why it is relevant indeed, report which odds ratio the study was able to demonstrate as significant given the sample size and assuming 5% significance level, 80% power (or higher) etc. etc.

Response: we have now added sample size to the manuscript (see below):

The sample size for the SHHS II was calculated as 10,000 households using the prevalence of under-five child diarrhea as the key indicator assuming a prevalence of 20%, a design effect of 1.5, 16% of the total population to be under-five children, and a participation rate of 90%.

The results reported in this paper were based on data from 3,504 women with the primary outcome non-use of antenatal care. We estimate that this sample has 80% power to detect an odds ratio of at least 1.24 or a difference of prevalence of 5.7%, assuming an alpha level of 5%, prevalence of non-use of
ANC of 60%, a design effect of 1.25 (based on other surveys), and a total sample of 2800, which was obtained by dividing 3500 by the value for the design effect.

We consider this sufficient statistical power to examine differences in non-use of ANC that would be of public health significance.