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Author’s response to reviews:
Response to Editor’s and Reviewer’s comments

Dear Eva Szunyogova,

Thank you for your email. Below is a response to the editorial comments.

Comment 1. Please remove ‘BMC Public Health Title Page’ text from the ‘Title Page’.
Response: This has been done

Comment 2. Please ensure that the initials used in the ‘Authors’ contributions’ section exactly reflect the names presented on the ‘Title Page’ including middle/second names.
Response: This has been done

Comment 3. Please provide Figure captions for all the Figures. These should be placed within the main Manuscript file, after the ‘References’ section, under ‘Figure legends’ heading.
Response: This has been done

Comment 4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different
colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: This has been done

Reviewer’s Comments

Dear Prof Gilbert,

Thank you for your very insightful comments. All the comments you raised have been addressed. Kindly see below:

Comment 1: Ref 5 is 26 years old.
Response: This has been amended. Pg 4 Line 2

Comment 2. Is this how vitamin A is distributed in Nigeria? This is not clear
Response: Yes. It has been modified. Pg 4. Line 9

Comment 3: Need to highlight that VAS coverage is below this target in many countries, including Nigeria https://data.unicef.org/topic/nutrition/vitamin-a-deficiency/
Response: This has been added. Thank you for the reference. Pg 4. Line 17

Comment 4: More clarity is needed in how the data are displayed so the reader better understands which variables were used in the multivariable analysis. All the data should go into one table, including

- Child factors: age group and sex
- Maternal factors: education
- Socio-demographic factors: zone, household wealth quintile
The findings of univariate analysis can then be added, and the findings of multivariate analysis.

Response: This has been done as requested. Pg 20

How can the OR for the unadjusted comparison of rural vs urban be 2.16 when the values were higher for urban areas?

Response: This has been amended. Pg 9 Line 2

Comment 5: ADD: what was the VAS coverage for children aged 12-47 months, all of whom should have received a dose within the preceding 6 months?

Response: This has been added for children aged 12-59 months as VAS is usually given to children between the ages of 6 months to 5 years. Pg 9 Line 10

Comment 6: and community based?

Response: This has been addressed. Pg 13. Line13.

Comment 7: 58%/37% is less than 2….

Response: VAS coverage was significantly higher in urban than in rural areas and the crude OR for urban versus rural was 2.16 p<0.001 while the adjusted OR was 0.87 p=0.001. It was the urban odds that was twice that of the rural. Pg 9. Line 2

Comment 8: Is this in Mali? Not clear

Response: Yes, its Mali. It has been amended. Pg 12. Line 19

Comment 9: Very repetitive = shorten

Response: Has been shortened appropriately. Pg 13. Lines 3-6

Comment 10: Move text below to here.

Response: This has been done. Pg 13. Lines 12-14