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08 December 2014
To
The Editor
BMC Women’s Health
Subject: Submission of Modified Article
Dear Sir,

We undersigned the authors of the article entitled ‘Factors associated with maternal anaemia among pregnant women in Dhaka city’ modified the article according to your comments and submitting for your kind consideration and necessary action. In this regard, we also prepared reply which is given below.

Kind regards
Hasina Akhter Chowdhury
Lecturer
Dept of Biostatistics
Bangladesh University of Health Sciences (BUHS)
and
Author for correspondence
Email: hachowdhury01@gmail.com; lima_125@yahoo.com

MS: 1110126443126440
Factors associated with maternal anaemia among pregnant women in Dhaka city

"The authors have responded to most of the reviewers' concerns. There are a few minor points that still need addressing:

1) In the regression analysis (Table 3), please clarify how the 3 categories included in Table 2 were collapsed to form a two-level variable.
Specifically, was Normal compared to Mild + Moderate Anemia? Also clarify how other variables were collapsed between Table 2 and Table 3 (education, income)
Reply: We revised our results section in the main text.

2) In the regression analysis (Table 3), please clarify that this is a multivariable model. Specifically, indicate in the text and the table that all variables are included in the model simultaneously. Also, please indicate why the other variables included in Table 2 (trimester, gravidity, history of supplemental iron) were not included in Table 3. If they were not significant, that's fine- please state that that is the case. But if only significant factors are included in the regression analysis, occupation should not be in the final model either.
Reply: We revised our results section in the main text.

3) The interpretation of results in the text does not match the odds ratios presented in Table 3- they appear to be reversed. If the reference groups and OR in table 3 are correctly ordered, the results should be interpreted as:
Age: women 25 and older had 2.9 times the risk of anemia compared to women < 25 years.
Education: literate women had 6.7 times the risk of anemia compared to illiterate women.
Occupation: (null)
Living area: women living in semi-urban areas had 3.0 times the risk of anemia compared to women living in rural areas
Income: upper middle income women had 3.8 times the risk of anemia as low and low-middle income women.

These interpretations, however, are not consistent with the data in table 2, which shows higher anemia in younger women, illiterate women, etc. Thus, I believe the results in Table 3 are flipped. Please fix Table 3 to make sure the numeric results reported are correct.
Reply: We have revised our results section in the main text.

4) In the discussion, it is stated that "less than 37% of women had anemia... and only 25 (11%) had moderate anemia." The use of "less than"
and "only" implies that this prevalence is lower than expected. However, in the conclusion, it is stated that "anemia in pregnancy is alarmingly high".

This does not seem consistent with the previous statement. Please reconcile these conclusions- is the prevalence high or isn't it?

Reply: Thanks to your valuable comments. We revised the discussion section according to your suggestions.