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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,

We have been working on reviewers and editorial comments and tried to address all comments accordingly. We would like appreciate all reviewers’ for their comments. The whole document is seen by English speaking Editor. We hope this version is more clear and avoid ambiguity.

Here are the responses for those comments:

Comment#1. Please clarify if consent was written or oral in the methods section.
Response: corrected accordingly (line 175)

Comment#2. Please specifically mention the contribution of each author in the Author's Contribution section.
Response: corrected accordingly (line 382-392)

Comments#3. Please include a list of abbreviations used in the manuscript.
Response: included next to acknowledgement

Comment#4. Under the crude OR column: a) Marital status is missing the reference category of “1” b) The COR and reference are reversed for Land ownership c) The COR is missing for place of delivery Also, food secure, as the reference category, should be listed last, not first.
Response: Comments are accepted. Regarding the AOR for Place of delivery since the numerical values of standard error is very large. We deliberately left not to include in the AOR model. But, we think it is better to avoid confusion so that we omitted the variable because of large standard error and non-significant p –value during COR. (table 3)

Comments#5. There are ongoing significant problems with English and grammar (at least 30 examples I can see in the latest version). This has made it very difficult to review as there have been several occasions where meaning has been ambiguous or obscured completely. I suggest an English editor provide input.
Response: we have recruited native English speaking editor and modified the contents accordingly. We hope now it is clearer and avoid ambiguity.

3. The text does not clearly explain whether the full original HFIAS was used or items selected.
Response: We have edited and avoid ambiguity about this issue (See 202-210

4. I suggest making clearer the links between the two sentences in lines 249-252. 5. Line 261 mentions policy in a vague, inappropriate way. Policy is not designed to uncover effects, but rather to direct service provision. 6. Line 278 does not make sense.
Response: We have edited and avoid ambiguity about this issue (See lie 343-345)

Thank you,