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Title: Determinants of prenatal anemia in Asossa Zone, Ethiopia

POINT BY POINT RESPONSES

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the reviewers and editors for their view and forwarding constructive comments. The comments are very important which will further improve the quality of the manuscript. Based on the comments the point–by–point responses are given below.

Reviewer#3

Reviewers comment Response to comments

1. In the title, please delete "West". Answer: Thank you dear reviewer. I corrected the title as per the comment. Also a bit modification is made to the title to make it more precise by considering a philosophy named “Economy of words” in scientific writing.

2. The manuscript must be reviewed by a native English speaker. Answer: the manuscript is thoroughly edited by the authors to improve the quality of written English.
3. It is not clear how participants were recruited for this study. Was it during a planned visit? Was it a special visit for the present study? Answer: pregnant mothers who came for their regular ANC follow-up were included in the study, given that no special visit is considered for this particular study. Consequently, a bit information is added at the beginning of the first paragraph of the ‘Study population and sampling procedure’ section.

4. Please provide the total number of pregnant mothers attending ANC in the previous year. Answer: Thank you dear reviewer, the total number of mothers who had ANC follow-up in the previous year is now included in the second paragraph of the ‘Study population and sampling procedure’.

5. The number of months since the start of the pregnancy must be taken into account in the analysis. Answer: The concern is well accepted. However, hence it is more clinically/technically sound to describe number of months of pregnancy in trimester, we used to state the number of months since the start of pregnancy in trimester as it is described in the first paragraph of the result section and in table-3 as a variable named ‘Gestational age’.

Moreover, the variable ‘Gestational age’ is considered/fitted in the final model as potential determinant of anemia as it was listed in table 4.

6. Some of the characteristics reported in tables 1, 2 and 3 are not taken into account in table 4. The reasons for that are not clear. Answer: As we have described in the ‘Data processing and analysis’ section, we used a variable selection criteria of P-value<0.2 to screen variables for the final model, multivariate analysis. Obviously this selection criterial is important to prevent problems associated with model over-fitting, getting biased estimates (a coefficient (odds ration) with larger or extremely smaller value and extremely wider confidence interval, for instance).

Therefore, we fitted variable with a p-value of <0.2, in the bivariate analysis, into the final model. So, this is the reason for not including all the variables listed in Table 1,2 and 3 into Table 4.
But, yet I know that, some variables which showed consistently significant association with anemia in the former studies could also be included in the multivariate analysis regardless of their p-value in the bivariate analysis. As an illustration, we considered wealth status, consumption of iron rich food (meat consumption), gestational age and parity as to include into the final model regardless of their p-value, but unfortunately these variables were found with a p-value of <0.2 in the bivariate analysis which fulfilled the variable selection criteria.

Thank you!!!!