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Author’s response to reviews:
Dear Natalie, thank you again for the review of our revised paper. We address the Editor’s comments below, we have made these changes in the revised manuscript and have attached a clean and track changed version.

We look forward to your response.

Kind regards
Thomas Gyan

Editor Comments:
Thank you again for revising your manuscript following the last set of comments received.

• Thank you. We have addressed all the suggestions and comments point by point below
You don’t need to include “Ref” in Column 5 under Model 1 Adjusted OR in the “Distance to Health Facility” row, given there was no reference category for this variable, as it was not included in Model 1.

• We have removed the “Ref” in Column 5 under Model 1 Adjusted OR in the “Distance to Health Facility” row.

There is just one remaining question I have about your results table (Table 2). According to your methods and footnote to Table 1, Models 1 and 2 adjusted for the following variables:

*Model 1. Adjusted for income status, cost of circumcision, religion, maternal education and maternal age
** Model 2. Adjusted for income status, cost of circumcision, religion, maternal education, maternal age and distance to health facility

If that is the case, why do some of the other variables included in the table (Maternal occupation, Site of Delivery, Birth weight, Age at circumcision) that were not mentioned as being included in these adjusted models, have odds ratios listed? Were they also included in your models or not? This is unclear. Please either fix the tables if these variables should not have any ORs listed, or explain in your methods section and in the footnote if the additional variables were also included in these Models.

• We have now changed the wording in the statistical analysis section on page 6 lines 146 to 152, to be “Crude logistic regression models were used to examine the effect of infant and maternal characteristics on the type of circumcision provider (informal vs formal). Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated. Multivariable logistic regression models were constructed apriori to adjust for the effect of important explanatory variables. Model one included infant and maternal characteristics adjusted for income status, cost of the circumcision, religion, maternal education, and maternal age. Model two included all of the variables in model one with an additional adjustment for distance to health facility.
• As suggested we have also included the following additional information in the footnote in Table 2 “Model 1: infant and maternal characteristics adjusted for income status, cost of the circumcision, religion, maternal education, and maternal age. Model 2: infant and maternal characteristics adjusted for income status, cost of the circumcision, religion, maternal education, maternal age and distance to health facility”