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Overall view

The article has focused on diarrhea and its determinants in a developing Region of Ethiopia and factors related to water, sanitation, and hygiene. The study content is relevant to the Ethiopian context, where open defecation is still persistent.

A. Major Compulsory Revisions

Title: Pls revise the methods section: risk factors can not be determined by a cross sectional. Did you want to say determinants?

1. Background section (Change the "Introduction" title in to Background)
1.1 Pls follow the structure of this section in chronology order: Background information, statement of the problem focusing on what is unknown ie gaps that initiated this study, and finally the significance

1.2 No relevant arguments on the needs of the study Vs gaps description

2. Methods section

2.1 Pls indicate who are really study subjects in a household with > 1 wife?? This can be addressed in the sampling section as well

2.2 Include the inclusion criteria briefly

2.3 The descriptions on sample size under "Sampling and Variables" must be stated separately. Likewise the variables should not blended in this section. Pls address each separately

2.4 Which child was taken as an index for a diarrhea if there are > 1 under five children?

2.5 There are two specific objectives that require adequate sample size. How would you verify if the sample size that was calculated to address the 1st sp objective is adequate for the "risk factors" objective??

2.6 What tools were used for assurance of data quality as checking of completeness as stating checking the quality does not mean any thing

2.7 Elaborate how the multivariate logistic regression was planned and done. The description indicated in the result section must be a part of the methods. Results are just results.

2.8 Ethical statement: better to state as "Ethical Consideration"; also Indicate how privacy was maintained;

3. Results

3.1 Correct Result as Results
3.2 7% of non-response is really a big number. Pls describe what causes? The implication on the results while discussing or considering as a limitation.

3.3 Pls operational what a no dirt floor means for the methods section.

3.4 464(94.3%) of the toilet facilities were improved type mainly simple and ventilated improved pit latrines. What is simple means is unclear. It is not seen in the operational definition.

3.5: pls consider operational definition what "hand washing". It is also good to clarify if this include soap or not: data is based on reported or observed?

4. The rationale of this study was that diarrhea is high in Somali Region. Now you have 14.6% which relatively lower those other study areas as well. Pls have a relevant argument by looking at the study areas (Rural vs Urban), latrine coverage, hand washing rates, etc. Do not speculate too much based on intentions.

5. Minor Essential Revisions:
None, but comments attached with pdf tracked.

6. Discretionary Revisions: None, but comments attached with pdf tracked.

7. Level of interest: a MS of high concern for developing countries

8. Quality of written English: OK

9. Statistical review: it is not a major concern

10. Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.

11. Reviewer's recommendation to the Editor in Chief: Accepted after handling the above comments.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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