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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer comments BMCHSR

Thank you for your helpful and constructive comments for the feedback below. We have made all changes, ensuring in particular accuracy in the table. We have edited down the text we added in last time in response to reviewer one and have clarified all queries. Apologies, we have now clarified where we have made these changes.

In terms of reviewer two comments three and four, we have revised the text to include means and standard deviations and percentages for the significant results. We could add percentages and means to the tables, but this would make the tables much larger, increasing space, for non-significant results. We are happy to do this if required but are aware that we have been asked to ensure we save space with the length of the paper through other comments.

Editor Comments:
As reviewer one was unavailable to assess the requested changes, I have assessed the revised manuscript. Please address the following points in the second revision:

• Please note in the methods what the level of ‘significance’ is set at for interpretation. Then remove the word ‘significant’ when used prior to association throughout the manuscript. There is no association if the finding is not significant.

We have added the significance level on line 237. We have removed the word significant where relevant.

• Please remove page 10 line 250, ‘A chi square test’, and line 256 ‘A series of chi square calculations’. This is methods information there is no need to repeat in the results section

We have removed any reference to the tests used throughout the results section.

• Page 10 line 263, please remove ‘For details please see table three’ and add ‘(Table 3)’ at the end of the first sentence that contains information relevant to Table 3. Please be consistent throughout the manuscript and capitalise reference to ‘Table…’ e.g. page 11 line 285

We have revised each reference to the table including ensuring it is capitalised.
• Page 11, line 285, please remove ‘T tests’

Removed

• Page 11 line 291 please join the sentence to a paragraph. A paragraph by definition is at least 3 sentences long

Merged with previous paragraph.

• Page 11 line 306, please be consistent with SD=, and change ‘SD:’

Edited.

• Page 14 line 380, which study is being referred to? The ‘previous study’ or the current study?

We have added further details.

• While some of the information added on page 17 is needed and in response to reviewer 1, it has added a lot of unnecessary repetition and considerable length to the manuscript. E.g., reference to women centred care- this is mentioned in other places in the discussion, as is the impact of family in health decision. Please revise to reduce repetition while still addressing the need to highlight the implications.

We have reduced this section down as requested.

• Please do not use ‘this’ an opened sentence in a paragraph as has been done on page 17 line 481 and line 490. Each new paragraph should contain a separate idea or point, and therefore it is not clear what ‘this’ is referring to.

We have amended this.

• Page 17 line 497, please remove ‘those’ and replace with ‘people’.

We have amended this.

• Page 18 line 518, please change ‘research’ to ‘researchers’

We have amended this.

• Table 1, ‘illiterate’ is not a ‘level of education’. Please change

We have amended this.

• Table 1, please note at the bottom of the Table what S.R stands for

We have amended this in the table.

• Table 1 please change ‘Demographic characteristic’ to ‘characteristics’
We have amended this.

• Table 1 please reside the heading and remove the word ‘split’ and replace ‘those’ with ‘people’ or ‘women’. Please added ‘appointments’ and the appropriate n= number. following the headings ‘missed’ and ‘attended’. Please add (n=242) at the end of the title

We have added these details.

• Table 1 please add ‘years’ following the age categories

We have added this detail.

• Table 1 please remove references to ‘no data’ and add a footnote noting the amount of missing data e.g. *n=5, ^n=1

We have amended this.

• Table 1 – why are these numbers not adding up to 242?

Apologies, we are not sure what happened with the numbers in this table and have revised all numbers to make sure it is accurate (and reflects the two groups as requested by the reviewer).

• Please consistently label all the Table numbers with a digit number e.g. Table 1, Table 2

We have made these changes.

Please respond to each point individually (17-21) made by Reviewer 1 (copied below) and note exactly where in the manuscript the changes have taken place (page number and paragraph/ line).

We have replied below

Discussion
17. Para1, lines 270-272: The author may consider putting the information here in perspective for the reader by indicating for instance that "this study explored association between potential factors that have been previously identified by mothers in a qualitative study …………"

We have added in this wording

18. Para2, lines 279-280: It is not clear what the author want to communicate here?

We hope we have clarified.

19. Para3, line 285-295: Could this be that the findings here were as a result of the sample size? (Type II error)

We have added in details of our power calculation and clarified in the discussion that it might be a
limitation of the data that in research such as this populations tend to be older with a higher level of education (rather than say looking at secondary data / hospital records). Please see line 393 onwards.

21. It appeared that the discussion chapter is a comparison of the current study with previous ones lacking critical thinking discussion. The findings were not presented in the context of previous studies so as to identify potential future study areas.

We have added further information and discussion for your points throughout the discussion.

Please ensure in your response to reviewers that you note exactly where in the manuscript all changes have taken place (page number and paragraph/line).

BMC Health Services Research operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:
Hung-Hui Chen, Ph.D (Reviewer 2): BMC Health Services Research
Manuscript Number: BHSR-D-19-01891R1
Manuscript Title: Clinical facilities and staff communication skills influence care attendance in Saudi Arabia

The reviewer's comments:
Overall, I recommend that this manuscript requires major correction before resubmission.

1. Table 1:
1) Table 1 added up to 241 individuals, but your abstract stated 242 pregnant women. Which one is correct?

Apologies, we are not sure what happened with the numbers in this table and have revised all numbers to make sure it is accurate (and reflects the two groups as requested by the reviewer).

2) The "N" in the Table heading should be non-capitalized small "n" for subgroup sample.

We have amended this

3) The percentage in the "Missed" Column and "Attended" Column should be column percentage, such than the column percentage for each variable should add up to 100%.

We have amended this.

2. Table 3: Please also show n (%) for every bivariate analysis of chi-squared test, not only the chi-squared value. Correct p=1.19 for age.
3. Table 4: Please show mean (SD) for every bivariate analysis of t test, not only the t-value.

We have revised the text to include means and standard deviations and percentages for the significant results. We could add percentages and means to the tables, but this would make the tables much larger, increasing space, for non-significant results. We are happy to do this if required but are aware that we have been asked to ensure we save space with the length of the paper through other comments.