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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sir,

I, the corresponding author, on behalf of the researchers would like to forward my appreciation for your constructive comments. As per your request, I am forwarding the point by point response starting from that of the first reviewer’s.

Reviewer 1: Jamila Abd-Arrahman Ahmad Abuidhail, Ph.D

1. This manuscript is well prepared and well written, but I noticed that you did not write anything about ethical approvals and considerations in the manuscript, although these are initial steps before conducting the study, please write this part.
Response: The ethical approval is written in detail along with the file number under the declaration section (Page 15, Paragraph 1).

2. Secondly, the sample size calculations were not described and the sampling plan also. Would you please explain how did you calculate the sample size and how did you recruit the participants?
Response: Since complete enumeration during the specified period of time was taken, no sample size and sampling technique was employed. Recruitment of the participants is written in Page 6, Paragraph 2, Line number 110.

3. Finally, the conclusion is similar to discussion, you have to rewrite it to be as 'a message to be taken home' from the study, not repetition of results and discussion.
Response: As per your recommendation, the conclusion is re-written in such a way as ‘a message to be taken home ’ (Page 16, Paragraph 3).

Reviewer 2: Ahmed Abbas
The authors provide the article in simple and interesting way. The results and discussion are very good.
Response: Thank you.

Editor's Comments:

1. In compliance with BioMed Central editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#standards+of+reporting), please be sure that your manuscript adheres to the STROBE guideline for Observational studies. Please complete the STROBE checklist in full by inserting the page number/paragraph and section of your manuscript, which reports the information that meets the criteria of the checklist, for example “Methods, paragraph 2”. If a criterion is not applicable for your particular study, we can accept “N/A”. Be sure to provide the completed checklist as a supplementary file.

You can download the STROBE checklist at the following page: https://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=strobe-home

Response: As per your request, it is attached.

2. We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:

-"Maternal Knowledge on Postpartum Care in Healthcare Centers of Mashhad, Iran in 2013"
http://jmrh.mums.ac.ir/article_4810_548.html?action=article&amp;kw=knowledge&amp;kw=353

-"Effect of Ethiopia’s Health Extension Program on Maternal and Newborn Health Care Practices in 101 Rural Districts: A Dose-Response Study"
https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0065160

This overlap mainly exists in the Background and Discussion sections.
While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. We would therefore be grateful if you could reformulate in your own words the overlap between your manuscript and other sources.
Response: With apology on the previous event, they are well formulated currently.

3. We note that GB is included in the Authors list, but is not included in the Authors' Contributions section. Please ensure that all authors are included in this section.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authors are expected to fulfill the criteria below (adapted from McNutt et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Feb 2018, 201715374; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1715374115; licensed under CC BY 4.0):

Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the conception OR design of the work; OR the acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation of data; OR the creation of new software used in the work; OR have drafted the work or substantively revised it

AND to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study);

AND to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.
Response: Thank you for reminding us the information on authorship. It is correct that GB is included in the Authors list, but is not included in the Authors' Contributions section. However, GB is the corresponding author and this problem is addressed by changing GB (in the former manuscript) by GGB (in the currently modified manuscript).

4. Please remove the response to reviewers from the supplementary file, as it is no longer needed at this stage.
   Response: Thank you. It is done.

5. Please ensure that all of the relevant additional files are explicitly referred to in the main text.
   Response: Thank you. It is done.

6. Please proofread and ensure that when you upload your revised submission it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a
single clean copy of the manuscript. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

Response: Thank you. It is done.

Overall, we are grateful for all your assistance and suggestions.

Yours,
Ghirmay Ghebreigziabher Beraki