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Dear Editor In-Hyuk Ha,

Thank you for your quick responses on the revised version of our manuscript (Fekensa Hailu, Amsale Cherie, Tigistu Gebreyohannis, Reta Hailu Belda) entitled ‘Determinants of Traditional Medicine Utilization for Children: A Parental Level Study in Tole District, Oromia, Ethiopia (BCAM-D-19-01836)”. Once again we would like to thank you and the reviewers for the effort, expertise and time devoted to improve our article. The authors have seriously considered the comments seriously and took all necessary measures to improve the article. We fully agree to improve the manuscript as per the direction given by the Editor and comments of Reviewer. Thus, we have fully accepted the reviewer’s comments and Editor’s concerns.

Editor Comments:

The revised manuscript has been improved a lot. But I think you would need professional help, you can use any reputable English language editing service. I would like a certification of editing service. And the manuscript will need to submit not only the revised version using track changes but also the cleaned version.
Response

In order to improve the English of the manuscript, we gave to professional English language editor for language edition and proofread. We went for the experienced individual editor as the there is no budget and system to give to international English language editing service. We believe the professional service has immensely improved the readability and English of the manuscript. Besides, English language tutorial were reviewed to overcome some common mistakes that occur when writing in English (https://www.springer.com/gb/authors-editors/authorandreviewertutorials/writinginenglish) and (http://www.biomedcentral.com/getpublished/writing-resources). We hope the entire English language of manuscript has improved. However, we cannot provide certificate for it.

In the manuscript, each revised words, phrases, or passages are indicated using track change in the revised manuscript. We also attached the cleaned version of the manuscript. Moreover, the journal style has carefully followed.

Comment from Reviewer 1

The manuscript has been extensively revised and is much improved.
I believe that some English editing is still needed.
I would only suggest that parts of the subjects and methods is additionally improved to state or communicate the following message:
"The study aimed to assess prevalence of TM use in Tole District…(etc.).
Exploratory logistic regression was performed to detect cultural, socio-demographic or other factors possibly related to the TM use".
(This should be the message, wording can be different).

Response:

The comments are well taken and efforts are made to address them. The English editing has done.

Abstract section: p.1. L13, L16-20 and L26-29: The contents are revised and improved. P.1.L13. revised as “This study was aimed at assessing traditional medicine utilization and its determinants among parents of the children's case study of the Tole District of South West of Oromia, Ethiopia.”

Subjects and Methods section: P4-7; the wordings are improved.p.7.L15-22 rewritten as: ‘The exploratory logistic regression was carried out to identify the socio-cultural, socio-demographic, and socioeconomic factors determining the use of traditional medicine (TM). It was used to detect the association between the dependent variable and independent factors. Variables that demonstrated at least a trend towards univariate association with the outcome (defined as P&lt;0.2) were entered into the bivariate model. All tests were done at a two-sided alpha level of 5%.”
Sincerely,

Reta Hailu (PhD), on the behalf of co-authors.