Author’s response to reviews

Title: WOMEN's Knowledge of Obstetric Danger signs in Ethiopia (WOMEN's KODE): a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors:

Ayele Bali (ayele.bali@uon.edu.au)

Catherine Chojenta (catherine.chojenta@newcastle.edu.au)

Abdulbasit Musa (atinaf.musa2@gmail.com)

Deborah Loxton (deborah.loxton@newcastle.edu.au)

Version: 3 Date: 20 Jan 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Title: WOMEN's Knowledge of Obstetric Danger signs in Ethiopia (WOMEN's KODE): a systematic review and meta-analysis: SYSR-D-18-00214

Ayele Geleto Bali, Catherine Chojenta, Abdulbasit Musa and Deborah Loxton

Corresponding Author: Ayele Geleto

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.

Editor’s comment

Authors’ response

1. "The data analysis section (methods) seems a little bare on the data synthesis approach. From Figure 2 (results) readers know the researchers used a random effects model (presumably for single proportions). Could the authors should add a couple of sentences about their data analysis methods in the Methods section?"
Thank you for your comment. We accept your comments and we made an amendment in the “Outcome measure and data synthesis” by adding the following sentences: To take the study-specific true effects across the included studies in to consideration, the random effect meta-analysis model was employed. A random effect model for the reported proportion was used to present the pooled knowledge of women about obstetric danger signs that occurred at different stages of pregnancy and child birth.