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A point-by-point authors’ response for reviewers’ comment

Dear reviewer, we thank you for reviewing and providing us with invaluable and valid comments that will help us to enrich our manuscript. Based on your suggestions, we have incorporated the comments into the manuscript, and we have also provided a point by point response in the following table.

Comments (Reviewer 1)

Reviewers comment

Authors response

Author section: Page: 23 Line: 4 to 5, please, did you really need to state authors titles?  The authors title was removed
Method: Page: 7 Line: 38 to 40 is it not better to place the in text referencing at the end of the sentence before the full stop punctuation mark.

The in text referencing was placed at the end of the sentence before the full stop punctuation mark per your suggestion.

Discussion Page: 23 line 56 to 58, please you stated :"Furthermore, there was no nationally representative study, making our finding difficult to compare with national findings", please was it not possible if I understand you correctly to compare at least your current findings with the national findings as they do exist and you making reference to them.

Here we want to say there were no single study that covered the whole Ethiopia and presented the level of women’s knowledge about obstetric danger signs. However, there were several studies that were conducted at specific area of the country and we compared our current findings with them.

Authors' information Page: 3 line 49 to 59 please this is a repetition of what have already been done well in Page: 3 line 4 to 30.

We did this as per the journal guideline and we belief it is correct
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A point-by-point authors’ response for reviewers’ comment

Dear reviewer, we thank you for reviewing and providing us with invaluable and valid comments that will help us to enrich our manuscript. Based on your suggestions, we have incorporated the comments into the manuscript, and we have also provided a point by point response in the following table.

Comments (Reviewer 2)

Elizabeth Edoni

Reviewers comment

Authors response
The systematic review reports on an important public health problem on women's population with sparse evidence in sub-Saharan Africa with special Ethiopia. The knowledge of which would reduce mortality and morbidity among women's population.

The review have been thoroughly reviewed by a number of seasoned reviewer and the authors have responded to the issues raised in the question. It makes an easy read. Well done to the authors and reviewers! The review has great potentials. I wish the authors well in their academic endeavors.

Thank you very much for your appreciations
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A point-by-point authors’ response for editor’s comment

Dear reviewer, we thank you for reviewing and providing us with invaluable and valid comments that will help us to enrich our manuscript. Based on your suggestions, we have incorporated the comments into the manuscript, and we have also provided a point by point response in the following table.

General comments (Editor)

Reviewer's comment

Authors response

1. What was the justification for including only English language papers? It would be helpful to include this rationale in the manuscript.

   We included only articles published in English language because all studies done in Ethiopia are conducted by English language. This is amended in the inclusion criteria section by stating “Only studies conducted in Ethiopia and published in the English language were included because in Ethiopia all studies are conducted in English language”.

2. The low number of studies received from the searches is of some concern as it may mean the search strategy was not wide enough. I noted you did not report that experts in the field such as the study authors were consulted on the possible existence of other studies. Searches for grey literature also don't appear to have been conducted. This should be justified.
We believe the included studies were very low in number however, we searched for articles from too many (seven) databases which are with the recommended number of databases for systematic review. The low number is due to the limited study area since articles conducted only in Ethiopia were review. We tried to search for grey literature and include it in to the review but we have got no grey literature specific to the topic of interest. As far as our search, we have got no government report on the knowledge of women about obstetric danger sign in Ethiopia.

Regarding the consultation of experts, the search strategy and terms used to locate appropriate articles and the appropriateness of the databases searched were developed in consultation with expert librarian and discussed under the subtopic “Data source and search strategy”.

3. The kappa coefficient criteria seems low. Additionally, as there are so few studies, it seems strange not to have 2 reviewers independently doing all of the screening. This procedure is methodologically but it does weaken the methodology to a degree and the author should consider double screening due to their being so few.

We choice lower kappa coefficient criteria to widen the number of studies that could be included in to the review. Similarly, most reviews used substantial agreement of the kappa coefficient of (>60%). All procedures of screening for the articles (starting from screening articles by title and abstract to quality assessment) were done by two independent reviewer.

4. Although data extraction was seems to be conducted in duplicate, the authors did not report how disagreements were resolved.

We used the kappa coefficient criteria to solve any disagreement between the reviewer and discussed in the “Screening for the article” section

5. It was not reported if quality assessment was conducted by two independent reviewers.

Amendment was made in the manuscript that the quality for the included articles were assessed by the two reviewers independently.

6. On the first line of the results, the authors state the searches found 347 articles. This is incorrect. The total should be 343. The total of all records received was 347. Please amend this.

The number of studies is amended