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February 6, 2019

The Editor,

BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth

Dear Editor,

Submission of revised manuscript for consideration for publication

Please, find below a point-by-point response to reviewers’ comments on a manuscript we submitted for publication in BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth titled ‘Factors influencing use of supervised delivery services in Garu-Tempane District, Ghana’.

In revising the manuscript, we have carefully considered and addressed all the concerns raised by the reviewers. We hope this point-by-point response will make it easier for you (and hopefully the reviewers) to identify the specific revisions we have made.

The look forwarding to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Dr. John K. Ganle

Corresponding Author
Point-by-point responses to reviewers’ comments

Editor’s Comments:

GENERAL COMMENT: The paper is addressing an important issue, but there are still major issues to be addressed by the authors before we can decide about publication.

OUR RESPONSE: We are encouraged by the editor’s generous feedback and we have incorporated the comments and suggestions the reviewer made into the revised manuscript.

SPECIFIC COMMENT 1: One of the major issues is related with the logistic regression. If you argue that for instance living more than 10 km away from a health facility is eg 5.15 times less likely to be associated with facility birth, the OR should be far below 1.00 and not 5.15! An OR of 5.15 for distance $> 10$ km means that that distance is five times more likely to be associated with facility delivery.

OUR RESPONSE: We thank the editor for this very important observation and correction. We agree that how we interpreted the data in the text of the manuscript is misleading. In the revised manuscript, we have corrected these misinterpretations. The correct interpretation based on how we run the regression analysis is that women who lived more than 10km away from a health facility were 5.15 times more likely NOT to have supervised birth. This is consistent with the observed frequencies for the variable “Distance to health facility” as well as similar variables for which we misinterpreted the results. In the revised manuscript, we have accordingly corrected such misinterpretations.

SPECIFIC COMMENT 2: The second issue relates to the length (many parts are far too detailed for an international readership) and to the way the data are "discussed"in the paper. Discussion should not be just repetition of the findings. See for my detailed comments the uploaded attachment and rework your paper according to my suggestions. I have also suggested how you can shorten the paper, also by omitting table 1 and 2 and figure 1 and 2. These do not add any information which is relevant for your paper.

OUR RESPONSE: We again agree with the editor on the length as well as some of the details of the manuscript. As may be noticed from the manuscript’s review history, our first submission did not contain many of the details that the editor rightly complains about, including table 1 and 2. These details were requested by the first reviewers of the manuscript. However, given the suggestions from the editor and our own belief that much of that information may bore our readers, we have taken out tables 1 and 2 and figures 1 and 2 as well as other portions suggested by the editor. We have also edited the discussion section of the manuscript in line with the editor’s suggestion to remove repetitions of results.
In addition to addressing these major issues, we have addressed all annotated minor comments and edits that the editor generously made/suggested in the pdf version of the manuscript. All changes are clearly marked in track changes throughout the manuscript.