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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor
The authors would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their precious time and invaluable comments. We have carefully addressed l the comments. The corresponding changes and refinements made in the revised paper are summarized in our response below.

Regard
Mohammed Ahmed

Respected Editor in chief
Reproductive health Journal

Subject: Submission of revised version of a manuscript

(Manuscript ID: REPH-D-18-00363R2)
Title: Socio-cultural factors favoring home delivery in Afar Pastoral Community, Northeast Ethiopia: A Qualitative Study.
Mohammed Ahmed, Msc; Meaza Demissie, MD, MPH, PhD; Alemayehu Worku, PhD; Araya Abrha, PhD; Yemane Berhane, MD, MPH, PhD

Dear Reviewers,

We thank you for taking the time to carefully read our manuscript and for the valuable comments you have provided, which helped us in improving the revised paper that we are re-submitting for review. Please find below our detailed response to each of the comments.
We are sorry for not getting back to you sooner than this due to limited internet access that hindered our working efficiency.

Best regards

Dr Mohammed Ahmed On behalf of all authors

Comments

Respond

1 In the introductions [lines 47-58], you discuss a number of factors that hinder institutional delivery- is that specific to Ethiopia? Please make it clear.

Isn't only Ethiopia but other African counters. Sentences rephrased in a clear way in the revised version of the manuscript.

2 The introduction should contain a bit of information on why to chose to focus on the Afar region and if anything is known about these factors in the Afar region specifically.

We thank the reviewer for this observation, included information on why to choose to focus on the Afar region and factors, clearly identified accordingly and incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript.

3 I suggest deleting the following from the introduction: Moreover, the paucity of competent local researchers has also inspired us for the need of conducting an extensive research on the topic in the Afar region of Ethiopia. Therefore, this study was undertaken to explore the various socio-cultural barriers to utilization of delivery services by pastoralist women in the region.

The results from the present study are expected to generate useful insights and strategies to provide valuable inputs regarding the established socio-cultural factors that uphold women preferences to delivery. The sub headings of the results sections can be structured better Accepted a deleting, thank you for the suggestion, Corrected and incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript.

We have structured results parts by three categories and subcategory

1. The social factors for home delivery preference
   1.1. Women’s heavy workload
   1.2. Perceiving delivery as a normal process and trust on TBAs
   1.3. Family support system

2. Cultural perception, traditional practices and faith in religion

3. Women lack decision-making power

4 The paper focuses a lot on the factors resulting in home deliveries and it may be useful to incorporate it into the aims

   Yes many aims home delivery preference among many reasons due to a lack of studies for the skilled birth services utilization many reasons we are starting study focusing on institutional gapes, (providers and facilities factors

5 Please include a table with participant demographics

   Accepted and incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript

6 The results section seems to be split into two section: reasons for home delivery preference and reasons for avoiding institutional delivery
I think the results needs to be presented accordingly. If I am correct in the interpretation, then an introductory paragraph explaining this subtle difference is needed. Also, the headings then need to be structured accordingly as well.

Thank you to request for a wide explanation regarding splitting the results section majorities home delivery preference and reasons for avoiding institutional delivery but it is difficult due to interlink and lack of enough information for avoiding institutional delivery from study to add more

7 The discussion section seems to be summary of findings. Please incorporate a discussion of findings of other studies and how they compare to your findings.

We have to incorporate a discussion of findings 15 other studies and findings compared.

8 The discussion section should include: strengths, limitations and programmatic/policy implications

Strengths, limitations and programmatic/policy implications of the study addressed at the end of the discussion

9 Finally, in line 50 of the discussion, you use the term "worthless"- is this your interpretation or something from the participants?

We thank the reviewer for this observation and comment, deleted mistake term corrected in the revised version of the manuscript.