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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewers’ comments on ‘Risk Factors of Morbidity among Children under Age Five in Ethiopia’

We are very grateful for the reviews provided by the editors and each of the external reviewers of this manuscript. The comments are encouraging and the reviewers appear to share our judgement that this study and its results are significant contributions to knowledge. Please see our detailed response to comments. All changes to the manuscript are included in the text. We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission and are available to respond to any further queries that may arise.

Reviewer #2

Reviewer comment: I do not have any further comments regarding the information provided within the manuscript. I feel that, although improved from previous versions, the writing of the manuscript should further improved prior publication.

Authors’ response: We thank you for the precious comments you gave us to improve and shape our manuscript. We have considered all your comments and improved the manuscript.
Reviewer #3

Reviewer comment: In my view, the subsection “data source” does not actually reflect the content of the method; rather it only indicates where the data retrieved. Additionally, the authors mentioned that “a stratified two stage sampling procedure was used”, however, the second stage sampling was not described here. The authors have added citation here to show the source of the data and sampling procedure. In my view, readers should not be referred to other source to understand the methodology used to conduct the research. It would be more scientific to explicitly describe the procedure used here so that readers would easily understand the methodology without much trouble to refer other sources.

Authors’ response: We thank you so much for your valuable comments. The authors mentioned that “a stratified two stage sampling procedure was used”, however, the second stage sampling was not described here. We have corrected as: Enumeration areas (EA) were the sampling units for the first stage and list of households in EA were the sampling unit in the second stage. However, we belief that the subsection “data source” sufficiently reflect the contents of the method.