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Author’s response to reviews:

Point-by-point responses to reviewers’ comments

Ahmed Abbas (Reviewer 1):

Comment 1: Abstract: conclusions should be reduced

Our response: We have revised the conclusion of the abstract to shorten the length. The revised conclusion now reads: “There is need for more community-based interventions, including effective health education, active community mobilization, and male partner involvement to help generate local demand and uptake of supervised delivery services among women during childbirth”. Please, see page 2, lines 43-45 of the revised manuscript.

Comment 2: sample size is not clear. please explain in a simple way

Our response 2: We have re-written the sample size estimation in a manner that is easier to understand. The revision now reads: “Between 2013 and 2016, an average of 72.1% of women were estimated to have given birth in health facilities with skilled attendants in the Garu-Tempane district [9]. To estimate a minimum sample size that will allow for any significant statistical association between the outcome variable and independent variables to be detected, we assumed that 72% of the women who gave birth between January and December 2016 in the Garu-Tempane District had supervised delivery. Based on this assumed prevalence of supervised birth, and assuming a confidence level of 95%, a statistical power of 80%, and a 5% margin of error, we estimated a sample size of 327 using Cochran’s statistical formula [27]”. Please, see pages 7/8, lines 156-163 of the revised manuscript.
Ahmed Nassr (Reviewer 2):

General Comments: This is a cross-sectional retrospective questionnaire-based study of factors influencing use of supervised delivery services in Garu-Tempaine District, Ghana. The study is well written and discusses an important question. The authors addressed the limitations in the discussion section.

Our Response to Reviewer’s General Comments: We are encouraged by the reviewer’s generous feedback and we have incorporated the comments and suggestions the reviewer made into the revised manuscript.

Specific Comment 1: In the title. There is no need to mention "A cross-sectional retrospective study of"

Our response to specific comment 1: We have considered this feedback and realised that BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth’s guideline on writing a manuscript’s title requires that the design of the study is included in the title of the manuscript. We therefore felt that our manuscript will be non-compliant with this guideline should we take out the study design in the title of the manuscript. We have therefore not removed "A cross-sectional retrospective study of" from the title.

Specific Comment 2: In the abstract. Abbreviations were mentioned without being defined (NHIS, ANC).

Our response 2: We have revised the manuscript to define all abbreviations in both the abstract and main manuscript.