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Response to Reviewers

First we want to express our heartful acknowledge for reviewers. All the comments and suggestions are highly valuable to improving the manuscript.

Here are the reviewers’ comments and authors’ responses.
I. Reviewer 1

1. I prefer if the title is modified?

Response: Thank you for the suggestion, we did a modification accordingly. It highlighted by green color.

2. Authors Affiliation/Information and the use punctuation (Comma)

Response: Thank you we revised it accordingly.

3. Replace the word "Instituts" in the affiliations of all authors with "Institute" and Summarized the affiliation for authors who works on the same institution?

Response: Thank you, we did the revision accordingly.

4. The objective should be revised. Replace the word "aims" with "aimed" (Page-2, Line-27-29). Line 32, include punctuation after Ethiopia

Response: Thank you we revised it. See the track change mark.

5. Methods, remove unnecessary space immediately after Methods and before "An" (Line-37). Replace Twenty-four with "twenty four", i.e., remove hyphen.

Response: Thank you. We revised accordingly.

6. Result, I am not clear with the first statement. Would you mean the investigators/researchers identified...? in place of "participants identified..." (Line-48/49). Or could it be "HEWs and HDA were identified as trusted health messengers for rural mothers."

Response: we revised accordingly. It was typo. The intention of the sentence was “participants identified... “HEWs and HDA were identified as trusted health messengers for rural mothers.” As you write on your comment.
8. Better to use “Home to home” than house to house (line-55) and also in the document. Also line-58/59, after "Government", period (punctuation) is needed.

Response: Thank you. We modified it accordingly.

9. page-3, Line-5, it says, The findings of this study suggest that HEWs are a credible messenger for health messaging in rural Ethiopia, especially when using an interpersonal message delivery approach, what about the HDA?

Response: - As a summery, most of the study participants favored HEWs than HDA. So, we reached a conclusion in the favor of HEWs.

10. Keywords (Page-3), I think it is better to remove "Channel" and add "talking Health, Health messages, and messengers" rather Better to include/add "talking health", "Health messengers" and "Health messages" to got this publication easily in search engines in case it published

Response: Thank you, the suggestions improve the paper. We modified it accordingly.

11. Background: -

It is Better rather if you change in to Introduction

Page-3, Line-36): change the first word of the statement into "Interpersonal"

Page-4, Line-18-51): the last paragraph is too large, please break this paragraph into two, you can break it at "Therefore" line-29.

Page-4, Line-34-42: I think it is better to remove this one; unless it may be not clear or confusing for the reader. Actually what is its importance? unless it needs more elaboration.

Page-4, Line-41-45: summarize this statement with the following (next) statement).

Response: Thank you. The comments are valid consequently, accepted. Please see the track change. However, the reviewer asked us to remove the explanation about the project (Page-4, Line-34-42, and line 41-45). Yes, it may be good suggestion but, this manuscript is one chapter of PhD thesis which need a chronological sequence of three chapters. For this matter the information is important and should be appeared as it is since this manuscript is the first chapter of the project.
12. Research questions

12.1. It is good to have research questions. But, what about research objectives? Don’t you think it is not needed?

12.2. Do you think that you addressed the second Research question?. Have you answered this research question? I didn’t get a section in the result which answer this RQ? I do not think it is well addressed, so, it needs revision.

Response: - 12.1. Thank you. We put a general objective on page 4 line 29-30 which read as. “Therefore, this study explores credible maternal health messengers and preferred modes of message delivery approaches as perceived by rural communities in Jimma Zone”.

Response: 12.2. The second RQ asks about the reason of trusting one source over others, this research question addressed on result section Page 8. Line 50- 55 which read as;

“…We prefer health extension workers. We have many reasons: we meet them physically and answer our questions empathetically. Some times health professionals from district health office come and teach us about health and healthy life like utilization of maternal and child health cares”. (Female community member, Gomma district, age 27)

13. Methods

Study setting

The reviewer asked us to put further explanation about the study setting.

Response: The comment enriches the manuscript. We add some basic features of the study area. See the added statement by track change.

We put the data for here too

Study sites

Stake holders  Gomma  Seka  Kersa

HCs 11 9 8

HPs 41 37 32

HEWs 67 82 83

HDAs, 1251 1176 957
Projected population size  295184 286874 227959

((Jimma zone health department, annual bulletin, 2018)

14. Page-5, Line 14, "Jimma is 346 kilometers from Addis Ababa, the capital of Ethiopia" is better if changed to "Jimma town, which is the capital of Jimma zone, is 346 Kms far away from AA..." Line-16-17 on the same page should be edited.

Response: we edited accordingly. Please see the edition by track change.

15. Research approach, Put punctuation at the end of the paragraph (line-43).

Response: Thank you. Comment accepted.

16. Sample size and technique

Change "individual interviews" into "individual depth-interview or IDI"

The foot note on this page should be finished on the same page if possible (starting from line-55)

Response: - Thank you. We accept the suggestion. See the track change.

17. Data Collection and Analysis. It necessary to cite some of those references (literature reviewed) to develop IDI and FGD guides by Researchers (cite those reference at the end of the first statement after the word childbirth

Response: - Thank you. Following your comment, we put 3 references which were used for developing the tools.

18. Page-6, Line-30, Please replace the phrase "data gathering" with "data collection"

The last statement under this sub-section, which says "The summaries presented below reflect both widely-expressed ideas, as well as novel ideas that were mentioned less frequently." is not clear. What does summarizes presented below mean?
Response: Thank you. We revised the suggestion. And, widely expressed ideas to mean; the idea which most participants mention and agree on it during the interview. As you know, we used Atlas ti for analysis. To get those widely expressed ideas, we conducted word cruncher count output and further we did a network analysis to visualized the density of words and ideas mentioned by study participants. Consequently, we summarized the ideas of participants by forming categories and support each category by quotation which was inclusive.

19. Maintaining Research Trustworthiness

19.1. The statement on line-10/11 may not be clear for general readers, please make it pleasurable for the general reader, particularly "reflectivity" and "bracketing methods" is not clear.

   The duration of the interviews and discussions ranged from 45 to 90 minutes (prolonged engagement). Does this assure prolonged engagement? In addition to interviewer notes,

   Response: Thank you, the Authors understand that ‘reflectivity’ and ‘bracketing’ is a technical word; To address this issue, we explain well those technique to the readers, please see the explanation of these method on page 7 line 12-19. And taking a longer time with your study participants helps the researchers to establish better relationship with participants which further help to talk freely and willingly with them. Therefore, these specified time allowed us to collect details of information from the participants.

20. Researchers used observation as a method of data triangulation. If you used observation as additional data collection method, this needs to clarified in the method section and the result of observation should be included in the results/findings.

Response: Thank you again it is a valid comment.

We observed the nonverbal actions of participants during focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. This Manuscript is a part the main project. And the observation report used for assessing social desirability issue in the main project report. It should be removed from here. So, we did it accordingly.
21. Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, The reviewers request us to present a
detail description of study participant in each categories, FGD and IDI.

Response: - Thank you. We limit the number of sociodemographic variables to be presented on
the paper for two reasons.

1. Qualitative researchers always aim to explored detail explanation of the context other than
description. As Edmund Husserl explained the important of depth of context rather than counts.
So, we failed to add detail sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants but their
detail response.

2. Confidentiality issue: Stating the kebele name, age and years of experience, educational status,
income and other detail sociodemographic variable may compromise the participant
confidentiality given that there are only 2-3 HEWs per health post.

However, we added detail description of the study participants as additional files.

We also accepted the grammar edition suggestion.

22. Please replace the word Catagory" with "category".

Please indicate the quotes you used to illustrate the themes whether they were from the IDI or
FGD participants. Not only for this sub-section but also throughout the result section.

Response: - Thank you. We accept the format change. The Reviewer also suggested to mention
the source of each quotation.

At the beginning the result section, we write the list of IDIs and FGDs participants. For
example; If the quotation refers as ‘male or female community member’ on its foot then the
reader understand that it comes from Focused group discussion. If the quotation refers ‘MDA,
WDA RL, and HEWs’ on its foot, then the reader understand that it comes from IDI.

23. pager-8, Line-19: "Most participants... ", you can also consider and present the frequency of
coding
Response: - Thank you. We used the word “most” after reviewing the participant response on word cruncher/cloud on Atlas ti. We also use a network analysis to see the density of each family.

24. Under category 2; Better to put the word "Garee" and Shanee" in quotation

Response: Thank you. We modified it accordingly.

25. Theme-2: Preferred Messaging

Category-1: Interpersonal Approach

Add some other quotas from each other group. One quota is not enough. Reconsider to add more quotas for this sub-section. You put interpersonal means of communication as preferred one; but less described here in the result section. it should be more elaborated.

Response: Thank you. It is important comment. However, the present Quotation seems inclusive. On the other hand, it is unsensual to put two quotations in the same category.

26. Under Discussion (Page-12, Line-15/16: Add Southwest Ethiopia and Correct it as ".... in Jimma Zone, Southwest Ethiopia."

Line-20 replace the word "principle" with "principal"

Line-43, paragraph two, better to change "house-to-house" to "home-to-home"

Line-49, studies should be changed to study, unless you should have to cite more references. Similarly, for the word on line 27 on page 13.

Page-14, Line-41-45: this statement should be edited and revised again.

Response: All the suggestion and comments are accepted. Please see the track change.

27. Limitation of the Study (Page-15)

27.1. I prefer rather if you present both the limitation and strength of the study together.
Line-5-7: the sentence about "The finding of qualitative research may not be applied for general population", should be revised. Could it be "The finding of this study..."

Response: Thank you. We added strength of the study.

27.2. Line-9-10: could it be social desirability bias? It better if change this statement to whether the study was influenced by social desirability bias or not.

Line-12/13: Please change the word "discretion" to "description". Punctuation (,) should also be used between words; engagement and memo.

Response: Thank you. It is a valid comment. We should be honest towards our data otherwise we shouldn't be a researcher. In this research we acknowledged minimal probability of social desirability biased. However, we minimized it starting from participant selection process ups to applying trustworthiness criteria which mentioned on page 15 line 11-14.

27.3. Line-14/15 (last statement): Which type of triangulation is this one? Do you mean method triangulation? Better to specify the type of triangulation used in this study. You also mentioned observation as data collection method. Is it triangulated with IDI and FGD methods. Make a revision; either you remove ideas about observation from methods section under "maintaining trustworthiness" sub-section or add it here.

Response: Thank you for asking. Primary some people think that, method triangulation (Qualitative and quantitative) is the only type of triangulation as Creswell explains. (Creswell. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Hand book). However, there are also other triangulation methods such as participant triangulation, Data collection triangulation and analysis triangulation particularly Embedded type of analysis.

So, we used a data collection triangulation which were FGDs and IDIs.

Following your suggestion, we removed “Observation from trustworthiness section”.

28. Conclusion

Second statement (Line-22): please remove the word "overall", I think it is not necessary. You said, "Most participants prefer to get health information from HEWs through interpersonal
interactions. How many? How you can say most? How many FGD discussants? How many IDI participants?

Response: Thank you, we accept the removal of the word. Concerning to the number of participants who said what? we used word cruncher count/cloud and network Density viewer by Atlas ti software. The software didn’t allow to count cases by word but the number of ideas or words by families (themes). Therefore, by observing the density of the network, one can judge on the richness of the particular theme. Consequently, we used the word “Most” on our writing.

29. The last statement (Line-28-31) should be rephrased as "The HEWs should be motivated through provision of training and educational opportunity."

My general comment for this section is that, you entirely focused on HEWs and ignored the rest information sources. Conclusion should actually made from main results or findings. Please reconsider this case.

Response: Thank you. We accept the suggested statement.

30. Acknowledgement and funding

For which of their contribution the authors acknowledged the following individuals "Getachew Kiros, Kunuz Hajibedru, Corinne Parker, Yisalemush Assefa and Jaameeta Kurji? Actually their contribution should be specified and apparently known.

The funding organization should also be acknowledged for funding.

Response: Thank you. Those Authors were a member of data collection team. And Corrinne Parker review the first draft of the manuscript. Still she is unable to fulfil the authorship criteria. Please see the track change.

31. Authors' contributions

Please edit the first statement for language, the second sentence for space between words (authors short names). Replace the the word "on" (Line-20/21) with "to the ...", the phrase "...writing up the manuscript" with "write up of the manuscript", and "....approved final" with "...

All authors have read and agreed to the final manuscript."
Response: Thank you. We accept the suggestions. Please see the track change.

32. Ethics approval and consent to participate

Write separately the consent you applied for different participants. Which consent was applied on which participants (page-16, Line-28).

Response: - Thank you, it should be clarified. Here is what we did during the data collection period.

We prepared two consent forms (for IDI, and For FGD participants) which have two options; for written consent and oral consent.

Then, we presented the consent form for each study participant who were ether in FGD or in IDI. Those participants who can read and write signed on the written consent form and those participants who can’t read and write agree by oral consent.

33. Authors' information

Why you repeat this information here and on the cover page? If you put a section for "Authors information", you do not need to write the affiliations of all authors on the cover page, except for the corresponding author. Otherwise, you should have to edit for grammar and use of punctuation as well as for institutional affiliation.

Response: - Thank you. All the suggestions are accepted. Please see the track change.

34. Reference

Reference should be replaced with "References" to make it plural.

The last reference (Page-19), could it be written in lower case?

Response: We Accept the suggestions. Thank you!
II. Reviewer two

Dear Reviewer Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. Here we have responded to your concerns.

Reviewer #2:

1. While reporting results of the study participants no need of using terms like most of and some of because it seems quantitative study, so consider this thing and update some of references.

Response: We accept the suggestion and modified accordingly. The references hold a scientific fact despite a little bit older, if new scientific facts are not invented to disprove the existing one, its recommended to use it.