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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The objective of the study is not clearly stated in the background of the article. It is mentioned in the abstract, but it should also be in the body of the article. The authors should clearly outline the objective in the last paragraph of the background section. The study design is clearly stated. However, the sample collection is vague. Ten health centres were selected using simple random sampling. We don’t see in the article the names of these 10 centres. The respondents from these different health centres were all combined, but were they similar? Statistical analysis to show that there were no significant differences between the centres is not conducted. This weakens the conclusions drawn from the study. Another point is that it would have been better if the questions that were asked of the respondents were included in the methods section so that readers can better understand what questions were asked.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The objective should be clearly stated in the background of the article proper so the reader does not have to guess. The methods section should clearly state example questions that were posed to the mothers/caregivers. There is a lot of vagueness in the reporting on the questionnaire and also the data analysis. The selected analyses as well as the reasons for choosing those analyses should be clearly stated. Analysis to show that the 10 different health centres were not significantly different should be shown. If significant differences exist, then the results should be presented per health centre as well. Also, on the tables, frequency should have (n) while percentage should have (%). The discussion needs a relook, especially since it is not very clear about the proportionate division of the participants, i.e., how many participants came from which health centre, and were all health centres similar? Another point is that the authors report that mothers with higher education were more likely to seek medical care than those with less education and say this is similar to reports of MDG that within countries child mortality is higher in uneducated women. I don't see how their finding is similar with the MDG report as the authors claim. The authors should rethink and rephrase their comparison.
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

I think authors need to copyedit their work. There are some grammatical errors in the article.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

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

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

This reviewer has been recruited by a partner organization, Research Square. Reviewers with declared or apparent competing interests are not utilized for these reviews. This reviewer has agreed to publication of their comments online under a Creative Commons Attribution License attributed to Research Square and was paid a small honorarium for completing the review within a specified timeframe. Honoraria for reviews such as this are paid regardless of the reviewer recommendation.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.