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January 10th, 2015

The Editor,
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth

Dear Editor,

Re: Response to the Editor’s Comments for Manuscript#: 1261033346145405

We are so grateful for your further guidance regarding the above-mentioned Manuscript. We thank you for providing us with an opportunity to make changes that we did not adequately address in our previous version.

In this version, we have addressed the comments raised in the previous Manuscript and provided a point-by-point response to the comments raised.

We look forward to receiving your further guidance on this subject.

Regards,

Owor Michael Odoi
Corresponding Author
## Comment Response

### #6b

The statement "We estimate that this study had a power of 80.5% to detect a significant difference in the utilization of all beneficial newborn care practices between the two districts, at an alpha-level of 0.05." does not make sense - a power estimation must relate to an effect size, e.g. an odds ratio. The statement should read, for example: "We estimate that this study had a power of 80% to detect an OR of x as significant at an alpha-level of 0.05 when comparing the utilization of all beneficial newborn care practices between the two districts."

**Authors’ response:** We thank the Editor yet again for this suggestion. We have corrected the statement and it reads as follows:

We estimate that this study had a post-hoc statistical power of 81% to detect an odds ratio of 0.64 as significant at an alpha-level of 0.05 when comparing utilization of all beneficial newborn care practices between the two districts. Please see page 9, lines 178-181 for details.

### #7

"while it would have been preferable to discuss the limitation posed by many women not knowing the distance to the facility where they delivered from, we have opted to keep any reference to distance outside the discussion section". This is not a convincing argument. Since the authors agree that it would be preferable to discuss the lack of information on distance to health facility - a usually powerful determinant of health service utilization - as limitation of the study they should include this issue in the discussion section.

**Authors’ response:** We thank the Editor for this suggestion.

We have included the lack of information on distance to health facility as a limitation as per the Editor’s suggestion. Specifically, we indicate that our finding that there was no association between distance to the facility and utilization of beneficial newborn care practices at the bivariate analysis should be interpreted with caution since this was only done in those who knew the distance to the facility, who represented only 28.6% of the population studied. The text has been amended to reflect this discussion (Please see page 14 (line 294-305) for details).