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A point-by-point authors’ response for editor’s comment

Dear editor, we thank you for reviewing and providing us with invaluable and valid comments that really helped 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor’s comment</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. With regard to the English language justification, I don't feel the response was grounded in evidence. It may well be that all studies conducted in in Ethiopia are done in English however the authors would need to justify this statement with evidence to make this claim. Additionally, if this were the case, there would be no need to screen out studies based on language so it's not a true justification for using it as an exclusion criteria. It is perfectly acceptable if the authors included this criteria based on efficient resource use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and believed the risk of bias was limited and give some evidence or experience stating how it would be very unlikely to find studies conducted in other languages.

We did not limit our search to a specific language, but only articles published in English language were returned and were included into this review. Amendment was made for the manuscript in the inclusion and exclusion criteria section by stating, “Although the search was not limited to specific language, only articles published in English language were returned during the search process”.

For evidence that we did not limit to specific language during the search, please you can see “supplementary file 1” that was already submitted with this paper during our first submission of this manuscript.

2. Searching for grey literature.

It is reassuring that searches for grey literature were conducted but please indicate in the manuscript that this was done and how it was done regardless of whether or not it was successful.

We tried to search for grey literature and include it in to the review but there was no grey literature specific to the topic of interest. Regarding our search, there were no government reports on the knowledge of women about obstetric danger signs in Ethiopia. This “Data source and search strategy” section of the manuscript was amended by including “We also tried to manually search for grey literature to include in to the review, however, no grey literature specific to the topic of interest was found for Ethiopia”.

3. Did you consult with experts such as included study authors to supplement the searches after they were conducted, to find any potential studies not already found? If so, please indicate that in the manuscript.

We contacted with the authors of the included articles (the manuscript was amended by including your comments in the result part by stating as follow: “Four additional studies were identified from other sources such as searching the reference lists of relevant articles and communicating with the authors of the included studies for further information”. We also consulted with an expert academic librarian in designing search strategy to locate appropriate articles (discussed under the subtopic “Data source and search strategy”).

4. Kappa coefficient

It is reassuring that all articles were screened, extracted and assessed independently by two reviewers but I'm not sure I understand your use of the kappa coefficient. How does using a lower coefficient widen the number of studies to be included and how can it be used to resolve
disagreement? AS far as I'm aware it's just a measure of agreement between the reviewers not a means to resolve this agreement. Please explain this methodology and expand on it in the article.

Kappa coefficient of $\geq 0.6$ is actually not low. The kappa coefficients of 0.01-0.20 indicates slight agreement; 0.21-0.40 fair; 0.41-0.60 moderate; 0.61-0.80 substantial agreement while 0.81-1.00 indicates almost perfect agreement. We used kappa coefficient of $\geq 0.60$ and the agreement to use this cut off point was made through discussion between the two reviewer. This was amended in the manuscript “Screening of the articles” section.