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The Editor
BMC Public Health

Subject: Response to reviewers’ comments and revision of manuscript # MS: 1434614079141540

On behalf of all authors, I thank you for arranging the review of our manuscript. We also thank to the reviewers for their valuable feedback and comments that help us improve the paper. Please find below our responses to the comments made by the authors. I have also attached the modified version of the manuscript that addresses the comments.

Please note that apart from adjusting for the editorial revisions suggested by the reviewer, the manuscript has now been edited by a native English speaker who has experience in editing scientific manuscripts.

Response to reviewers’ comments

**Reviewer: Alina Flores**

Abstract and Paper:
1. Authors appear to have addressed major revision needs from prior review. There are still outstanding revisions needed however, as listed below.

Compulsory Revisions needed:
2. Overarching revision: it seems that this study is subject to various limitations; however no limitations section is noted in the paper. Authors should include limitations to study.

Response: We have now included limitations of the study in lines 385-390.

Editorial revision needed. Although some are more minor than others, these revisions are necessary in order to provide credibility to the manuscript.
3. Line 14: woman’s should be women

Response: This comments has been incorporate in line 14.
4. Line 17: tablet should be supplementation

Response: Revision has been made in line 17.
5. Line 20: ‘a targeted home visits…’ – ‘a’ should be removed

Response: Has been removed.

Response: The preposition ‘for’ has been deleted.
7. Line 36: insert ‘a’ in between ‘to’ and ‘higher’ – should read …‘birth to a higher proportion of low birth...’
Response: Has been inserted.

8. Line 42: IFA is first mentioned in the body of the text in this line, but has not been spelled out in full prior to this mention (abstract should not count). Need to spell out IFA and provide acronym in parentheses at this point
Response: ‘IFA’ has now been spelled out in full with the acronym between brackets in line 42-43.

9. Line 51: needs space between ‘and’ and ‘iron’
Response: Space has been provided.

10. Line 86: “we collection of data” should read “we collected data”
Response: The sentence has been corrected in line 86.

11. Line 156: ‘foods taboos’ should read ‘food taboos’
Response: Has been corrected in the revised manuscript.

12. Line 191: sentence beginning with “The users of IFA tablets” does not read well. Perhaps beginning with “The family members of users of IFA tablets perceived that...”
Response: The sentence has been revised in line 192 as suggested by the reviewer.

13. Line 225: were the tablets in the blister packs different from other tablets somehow? It is unclear from the statement why they would be unpopular with women. Seems like this would be important information for the discussion.
Response: This information was provided as a note and was not a finding of our study. So we have now deleted this note from the results section of the paper.

14. Line 236 and 238: ‘network’ should be ‘networks’ (plural)
Response: Have been corrected in lines 236 and 238.

15. Line 237: ‘student’ should be ‘students’ (plural)
Response: The word has been corrected.

16. Line 250: ‘workers’ should be ‘worker’ (singular)
Response: The word has been corrected.

17. Line 262: ‘on’ is missing from the sentence - ‘based on what’
Response: ‘On’ has been added to the sentence in line 262.

18. Lines 318-320 read poorly. Consider revising to: “Our study revealed that there is no local term for ‘low birth weight’ in Bangla (the language spoken by the study community. Although this could indicate a lack of expectation around a specific or minimal birth weight, families did express concern about having a health infant.”
Response: These two sentences have now been re-written as suggested by the reviewer in lines 318-320.

19. Line 327: ‘incidents’ should be ‘incidence’
Response: The word has been replaced with ‘incidence’ in line 327.

20. Line 354: end of the sentence “can be used to promote...” seems extraneous and does not mesh with first part of the sentence; consider deleting or re-wording phrase.
Response: The sentence has now been re-worded in line 351-353.

Thank you for considering publishing our manuscript in your esteemed journal.

Sincerely,

Ashraful Alam