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Dear Editorials of BMC Health Service

We would like to thank for your acceptance of our manuscript for publication on your accredited journal and we greatly appreciate for the comments, which helped us to improve the manuscript. Based on your requirements, we went through all points where you emphasized your comments and consequently, we included all what you enquired. We thank you the consideration and all goodness to this publication.

Point by point responses to your comments and requirements were given as follows:

Author 1:
Given name: Ephrem
Given name: Lejore
Family name: Sibamo

Author 2:
Given name: Tezera
Given name: Moshago
Family name: Berheto

Referee1:
Q1: Thank you for your comment, as per your enquire we made a correction on the abstract, analogies about satisfaction and services utilization is an assumption

Q2: Apology for creating confusion, Based on your comment health extension professionals replaced by health extension workers, commonly used interchangeably. They are nurses with special training on urban health extension program and they all are females. They work exclusively at community level

Q3: Thank you for your correction and we accepted the changes

Q4: on the document mentioned that females are not competent to deliver services” does not mean males are preferred; we are not comparing/ writing about gender. We used female to say urban health extension workers because all are female. Being female is the criteria to be health extension worker in the country.

Q5: Discussion 6th paragraph, last sentence: about the communities’ relationships with HEWs/female is not about competency of the Female/HEWs

Q6: Thank you for your direction we will consider it for future study
Q7: Thank you very much for the provision of good insight. However, the study considered the satisfaction the community with service, does not considered the aspect of provider and the quality of the service provision

Q8: That is correct. It’s that HEP is aiming to improve equity

Q9: Do you mean the HEWs here? Yes. We made a correction

Q10: Thank you for your educated view. As per your comment we made correction on table part.

Q11: As per your comment we moved the sentence to discussion part

Q12: We used references based on your comment

Q13: Thank for you suggestion and we recognize that the paragraph has no plausible implication, and then we omitted it.

Referee 2

Q1: We appreciate your comments and suggestions

Q2: Apology for the inconvenience we created regards to the calendar. It was written on the Ethiopian calendar which has 30 days for all 12 months. We made a correction as per your comment

Q3: Thank you for your suggestion, and we accepted the comment
Q4: We made modification and clarification as per your comment
Q5: Thank you for your hint, the purpose of the qualitative data was for triangulation
Q6: Consent was obtained for all participants (qualitative and quantitative) as per the protocol of human research. Data collection was by face to face interviewing, since the participants were from the community where literacy rate is very low, self-administered questionnaire is not relevant
Q7: Thank you for this case
Q8: We appreciate your comment, we agree that the discussion part is weak but as HEP is considered as innovative program in Ethiopia which has a recent history there is no international even very few national comparable literature regards to urban health extension program
Q9: Thank you, no comments mentioned

Q10: The references revised and formatted to the journal requirements
Q11: Thank you, No comments mentioned
Q1: We would like to thank you for detailed comment, and we made revision and correction as per your comment. The study period was written based on the Ethiopian calendar that has 30 days for all 12 months. We made a correction as per your comment.

Q2: Regarding suggestion to include percentage of men and women, we incorporated as per the suggestion.

Q3: We thank you for commenting on determination of sample size based on gender in the qualitative part, however, our motive in the qualitative part is to include respondents with rich information regards to the program exposure. We didn’t consider the gender issue.

Q4: Sorry for creating confusion. We use the word female interchangeably with health extension worker. For the sake of clarity, we replaced health extension workers in place of female. On the document mentioned that females are not competent to deliver services” does not mean males are preferred; we are not comparing/ writing about gender.

Q5: Thank you for your comment. We revised the paragraph and we added reference to elaborate more about the package. As indicated in result part in Table 3, (Delivery, Antenatal care, and Family planning) are considered as maternal health services.

Q6: thank you for commenting to include limitation of the study. It is already known that in cross sectional study design, the result does not indicate temporal relation.

Referee 4

Q1: Thank you for your constructive comments. As per the comment, we revised the qualitative method part.
   a. The objective of conducting qualitative part was to triangulation.
   b. We tried to provide more information about the qualitative method in the document.
      FGD was conducted with adult participants including male and female together because there was no gender sensitive issues to be discussed.

Q2: Model families were selected purposefully because they were assumed to have rich information about the program.

Q3: Village health committee members were parts of the community, they have a great role in the program and they participate in the planning and implementation of the program.

Q4: As we mentioned in the method part, the total sample size was distributed within all towns proportionate to household size, because we took one informant from one household.

Q5: We apologise for missing this information. The eligibility criteria were permanent residents of the towns and age greater than 18 were used as a respondent.

Q6: We thank you for commenting to include limitation of the study and it is already known that in cross sectional study design, the result does not indicate temporal relation.
Q7: We use the word female interchangeably with health extension worker. For the sake of clarity, we replaced health extension workers in place of female.

Q8: Thank you for your comments and we made corrections accordingly.