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Title: Women's knowledge of neonatal danger signs and its associated factors in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis

In general the authors tried to address the issues raised during the previous review, however there are still some aspects that need to be incorporated in order to improve comprehension, especially concerning your introduction and discussion which would be critically needs revision to be considered for publication.

Specific comments:

Introduction

The introduction section is not fully addressed also in the revised version except the first and last paragraph of your introduction all paragraphs are entirely about neonatal mortality. Even the authors didn't considered anything about the common causes of neonatal mortality both globally and in Ethiopia which initially might manifests with those general danger signs. It is important because, knowing those general danger signs might help mothers to seek care and ultimately neonatal mortality from those causes might be averted through early detection and seeking care.

Also it is good if the authors indicated the status of women's knowledge on neonatal danger signs globally or in other countries.

I recommend the authors to revise their introduction considering to write the flow of their idea: Starting with the 1st statement page 3 line 7-10 proceed with neonatal mortality in a summarized manner and then to causes of neonatal mortality, neonatal danger signs care seeking practices ….. ending with the last paragraph.

Page 3: first paragraph line 7-10: The statement better revised…. "…..therefore they need to be regarded with special nursery and special care"
Page 3: line 22-33: The authors didn't revised using the latest data available to indicate neonatal mortality rate, please use the latest one (WHO 2019 report is available). I recommend the authors to write data about neonatal mortality in a focused and summarized way with a paragraph than putting as it is.

Page 3: last paragraph line 48-56: The last sentence about place and why neonates die "The majority of these neonatal deaths occur at home where a few women and family members recognize signs of newborn illness and nearly all neonates are not taken to health facilities when they were sick." … this is indicated under the paragraph about neonatal mortality….the authors later on the next paragraph continued with mortality in Ethiopia. Please try to keep the flow of ideas within and between your paragraphs.

Results

Page 9: line 5-17: the authors have to correctly cite…out of 14 studies included… "Three of the studies were from Amhara region (16-18), three from SNNPR (19, 20), three from Oromia region (21, 22), three from Tigray region (23, 24), one from Addis Ababa (25), and one from Harar regional state (26)".

Page 7: line 30: study setting was written twice delete one and also this time there is no result of sub group analysis based on regions so you better remove region as well. "Subgroup analysis was done based on the study setting (study setting (region) and sample size….." also add sub group analysis was done based on the number of spontaneous responses given by women.

Discussion

Page 20: line 11-21: I think no need to repeat the results of factors associated with good knowledge under the discussion. "In this study, having higher educational status of the mother, having higher educational status of the husband, access to mass media, having antenatal care follow up, having postnatal care follow up, and giving birth at health institutions were factors associated with good knowledge of the women towards danger sign of the neonate."

In general the manuscript needs some editorial correction especially in the results and discussion section.

E.g. "The odds of having postnatal follow up were 2.55 times more likely to understand the neonatal danger signs than the women who hadn't antenatal care follow-up." And the sentence is about postnatal how the authors compare with antenatal care?? Better if you replace hadn't with have no postnatal care follow-up.
Page 20: line 44-47: I prefer if the statement which says: "The odds of having antenatal care follow up were 2.7 times more likely to understand the neonatal danger signs than the women who hadn't antenatal care follow up." was written again because it is not about the odds of having ANC but having knowledge on NDS. E.g. the odds of having knowledge on neonatal danger sign were 2.7times more likely among antenatal care attended women than those who have no antenatal care follow-up. Consider also for others factors.

It would be good if additional English review undertaken for the introduction, result and discussion section.
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