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Reviewer’s report:

Most of the comments raised in my first review were properly addressed with the exception of the following.

Major compulsory revision

1. In the methodology the estimation of weight gain is still not properly addressed. Gestational weight gain is derived based on maternal pre-pregnancy BMI. It is not possible to judge if a mother gains enough, too little or too much during pregnancy by just subtracting pre-pregnancy weight from weight before delivery. Therefore, authors should consider properly describing the process or drop weight gain in the analysis.

Minor essential revisions

Authors ignored some of the comments on clumsy sentences but I find them very necessary as they alter the meaning of the sentences. Therefore, authors may want to take a second look at them. They’re as follows:

1. The first sentence under the subheading culturally prohibited foods and reasons of prohibition during pregnancy of the result section is still not clear- ‘Majority of respondents described the presence culturally prohibited food items and their practices have the tendency to affecting feeding patterns during pregnancy negatively and considered as refusals if they are not carried out as prescribed by their ancestors’. This must be rephrased.

2. In the discussion section the 3rd sentences of the first paragraph is still not clear; ‘Prevalence of low birth weight was found to be 14.6%, which is similar with the LBW levels of sub-Saharan Africa countries1, relatively higher than DHS 2011 report which is 11%13 and it is less than the prevalence of LBW found in some parts of the country (17.1%, 22.5%) observed in Gondar University hospital and Jima respectively6,7 and this difference might be due to these previous studies were carried out in specialized hospitals where many of the pregnant women were referred from the peripheral hospitals because of high risk pregnancy’. This must be rephrased

Finally I think the language will improve a lot better if the manuscript is proofed
read by a native speaker.
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