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Reviewer reports:
Dear Tabassum Firoz, MD, MSc, FRCPC
Reproductive Health: Editor chiefs

Thank you very much for reviewing guide and support our manuscript entitled "Socio-cultural factors favoring home delivery in Afar Pastoral Community, Northeast Ethiopia: A Qualitative Study". (ID REPH-D-18-00363R1).

We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have incorporated the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer’s concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Reviewer reports:
Dear Tabassum Firoz, MD, MSc, FRCPC
Reproductive Health: Editor chiefs
Thank you very much for reviewing guide and support our manuscript entitled "Socio-cultural factors favoring home delivery in Afar Pastoral Community, Northeast Ethiopia: A Qualitative Study". (ID REPH-D-18-00363R1).

We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have incorporated the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer’s concerns. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Comment of the reviewer
Authors response
Abstract

1. Line 8: double full stop, delete one  Deleted in the revised version of the manuscript.
2. Lines 15-22: design and sampling and how recruitment of the study participant are not described.
   • As suggested by the reviewer, Corrected and incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript.
   • An explorative qualitative study was conducted to identify socio-cultural barriers to the utilization of maternal health services, For focus group discussions, all participants were purposively selected mainly based either on their experience of birth and birth-related traditions or being as influential persons in seeking institutional delivery services. Key informant interview (KII) participants, the main criteria for their selection were being an active service provider and knowledgeable about the local culture...

3. Background
4. Line 40: the "as" should be written as "at"
   Line 49: double full stop
   • Accepted and corrected accordingly
   • Methods
5. Study design and population: study design should be written and what recruiting method you have used too.
   • As suggested by the reviewer ..S. design:- An explorative qualitative study ...
   • The study participants were mothers/women, grandmothers/mothers-in-law and other key influential persons in the area of the study. All participants were purposively selected mainly based either on their experience of birth and birth-related traditions or being as influential persons in seeking institutional delivery services. The criterion for their selection was being an active service provider and profound knowledge about the local culture.

6. Line 18 and 27-30: what does it mean consulting health extension and local health workers? If you do consulting any bias?
   • To facilitate and get their support to find the participants mothers who had children less than 24 months of age, grandmothers and recognized male tribal or religious leaders without giving further information.
7. 1. Data collection: confusion in using phrases semi-structured open-ended Vs semi-structured and open-ended?
   2. What is the difference between semi-structured and open-ended?

3. Why oral consent for key informants? Can you justify for that. In ethical approval sub-section you have already mentioned you took a written consent.

4. Have you taken consent specially from KI for audio recording
   • 1. Now I have described it clearly in the revised version of the manuscript. The phrase Semi-structured and open-ended is used for questions in interviews
   • 2. A semi-structured interview is a meeting in which the interviewer does not strictly follow a formalized list of questions. They will ask more open-ended questions, allowing for a discussion with the interviewer rather than a straightforward question and answer format
   • 3. Accepted comments and corrected as it indicted in ethical approval
   • 4. Yes I have taken written consent from FGD& KIS for audio recording as mentioned in methods part

Result
8. Line 42: You have already mentioned in the methods section that FGD participants were between 6-10, but how do get from 18 FGD 186 participants?
   • A total of 186 individuals participated, in 18 FGDs; 60 mothers and 48 grandmothers and 54 male tribal or religious leaders. 162 Key informant interviews (KII) were carried out with a total of 24 participants 162+24=186

9. Lines 44-45: better to be written 24 participants as 24 key informants.
   Sentences rephrased as, Key informant interviews (KII) were carried out with a total of 24 participants; (incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript).

10. page 8 Line 21: double full stop
   Deleted in the revised version of the manuscript

11. Page 8 line 32: the quote is not closed. Replace the FGD women FGD woman
   Accepted and incorporated

12. Page 8 line 46: similar comments as above
   Accepted and incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript

13. Page 9 line 4: normal process Vs natural process, do they have difference in meaning? If yes why you use them interchangeably?
   • In this study, the word 'Normal process' is considered as usual process managed simply by TBA.
   • A natural birth will mean various things to different individuals. Midwives and obstetricians have their own operating definition of natural birth, that sits somewhere in between these different viewpoints. they have a tendency to speak regarding “normal birth”, instead of “natural birth”, though they'll use either term.

14. Page 9 line 27: This quote does not tell us anything about labour as a normal process. This quote should not be under this theme. It does
   • Yes, as. this quote was mentioned by mothers during interview who perceives delivery as a normal process and has a trust in TBAs.

15. Page 10 line 6-23: does this paragraph with its quote fit with the theme factors for preference: perceived delivery as normal process?
   In this study, the word 'Normal process' is considered as usual process managed simply by
TBA.
Yes, as this quote was mentioned by mothers during interview who perceives delivery as a normal (usual) process and has a trust in TBAs

16. Page 10 lines 22-23: similar comments as above (quotation Closed)
   Accepted and incorporated (quotation Closed)

17. Page 10 line 43: similar comments as above (Women)
   Accepted and incorporated (Woman)

18. Page 10 line 52: Similar comments as above (Women)
   Accepted and incorporated (Woman)

19. Page 11 line 43: Similar comments as above (Closing quotation is missed)
   Accepted and incorporated

20. Page 11 line 52: a stitch (font)
   Accepted and incorporated

21. Page 12 line 29: similar comments as above (Closing quotation is missed)

22. Page 13 line 29: KIs?? No full stop
   Accepted and incorporated. please see revised version

Discussion

23. This section is well written.

24. Page 15 line 13: the word "this"???
   Accepted and sentences rephrased

   We agreed with the reviewer, sentences rephrased

26. Author contribution: Requires re-arrangement.
   We agreed with the reviewer, and sentences corrected accordingly

27. Ethical Approval: "Written consent": contradicts with description you gave in the main sectioned methods
   Accepted and incorporated according comments

28. I have rephrase references # 5,16, 28,33 and in the revised version of the manuscript.