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Authors’ response/Response to Reviewers' comments

Reviewer reports:

1. Reviewer #3 comment #1: Congratulations to the authors for working hard on revising this paper. At this point, I still have some concerns on language, and some comments on content (methods and limitations).

Also, perhaps this is obvious for authors but actually it's not clear when reading the manuscript if included infants were born in 2011 and followed up for one year, or if infants were born between 2011-2015 and followed up for one year. Authors should add the actual birth years in Methods instead of saying “2826 infants born five years before the survey", and also check for time-period effects (was year included in the regression model?)

Authors’ response:

Dear reviewer, Thank you for your undivided support and guidance to improving this submission so that it is scientifically sound and attracts readers around the globe. We are too proud to get such strong comments from which we really learnt a lot.

With regard to the comment number one above, we have warmly accepted the comment and corrected it as: “Accordingly, 2628 infants born between 2011-2015 and followed up for one year during the five years preceding the survey were included into the study”

(Page 5, under method section, paragraph 2, line 5-6)

Dear reviewer, with regard to the “time-period effects”, we didn’t consider it due to the following reasons.
a. Since we used the Mosley and Chen’s conceptual framework which is very relevant to analyze factors that influence infant mortality in developing countries, including Ethiopia, the variable “time period”/years of birth was not listed under any of the three categories of factors (Proximal vs, intermediate vs, distal).

b. As per different published literatures on the same topic, the time-period/years of birth was not reported in any of the publications we found.

NB: From the reviewer’s strong comment and as authors of this manuscript, we also believe that failure to consider years of child birth/time period effect might have an effect on infant mortality. Thus, we have boldly included it as limitation.

2. Comment #2: Abstract: please check English throughout. "to promote infant survival" not "increase the infant survival"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected accordingly as: to promote infant health and survival (Page#2, under abstract, line #1)

3. Comment #3. Title: "Results from a survival analysis" (replace current text)

Authors’ response:

Dear reviewer, the commented accepted and corrections made accordingly as:

..Results from a survival analysis…

(Under title page)

4. Comment #4. Background p3, line 20: "The infant mortality rate is a key population health indicator". "A high infant mortality rate can reflect poor quality of care and/or lack of access to care.

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:

“The infant mortality rate is a key population health indicator [1]. A high infant mortality rate can reflect poor quality of care and/or lack of access to care [2].”
5. Comment #4. Line 35: add in which country
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, comment accepted and corrected as: globally, since it stands for global data.

6. Comment #6. Line 38: upmost not upper most
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: … an upmost global priority.

7. Comment #7. take out " Pertaining"
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly: … the word “pertaining” an taken away (removed).

Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: To reduce infant deaths, massive investment has been done including an access to improved basic health care, under-five nutrition, personal hygiene and environmental sanitation, and uptakes of breast feeding and vaccination [4].

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:”….. hygiene…."

(Page #3, paragraph #2, line 4)

10. Comment #10. Lines 47-48: specify in which years there were declines in IMR

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:….. over the last two decades”

(Page #3, paragraph #2, line 6)

11. Comment #11. Line 56: " the risk of a child dying before his first birthday is higher in the African region (52 per 1000 live births), and over six times…” (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: “The risk of a child dying before his first birthday is higher in African region…..”

(Page #4, paragraph #1, line #1)

12. Comment #12. " In Africa, the main risk factors associated with a high number of infants deaths include: " (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:

“In Africa, the main risk factors associated with a high number of infants deaths include:..”

(Page #4, paragraph #1, line #2-3)


Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and citations put as: “…. [4,6].

(Page # 4, paragraph #1, line #5)

14. Comment #14. Line 9: In addition, there is a higher prevalence in the region of those diseases that are infants are particularly vulnerable to such as: " (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: citations put as: “In addition, there is a higher prevalence in the region of those diseases that are infants are particularly vulnerable to such as:…..”

(Page # 4, paragraph #1, line #5-6)

15. Comment #15. Line 14: "vary across income groups, by level of education, based on residence, maternal child bearing age" (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: citations put as: …. vary across income groups, by level of education, based on residence, maternal child bearing age…

(Page # 4, paragraph #1, line #7-8)


Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, thank you so much.

17. Comment #17. Line 44: check grammar - is or are if just one rate than " is"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: … The 2016 Ethiopian Demographic Health Survey (EDHS) result showed that the infant mortality rate for the five years before the survey is 48 deaths per 1,000 live births.
18. Comment #18. Line 44. Take out " besides"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word “ besides” taken away.

19. Comment #19. Line 51-52: " which accounts for a 50% reduction in the last 16 years". "Among those infants that do not survive, about 72% deaths occur before the first birthday"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: which accounts for a 50% reduction in the last 16 years. Among those infants that do not survive, about 72% deaths occur before the first birthday

20. Comment #20. Line 59: is crucial not "could be crucial" ( replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: is crucial


P5.

Line 1. (…) relevant intervention strategies, that will contribute to reducing the burden of infant mortality in Ethiopia (add).

Authors’ response:
22. Comment #22. Line 1 The aim of this study was to assess the proximate, distal and intermediate determinants of infant mortality in Ethiopia. I’m not sure why the title still includes just one type? Add definition for proximal vs distal vs intermediate in the text (maybe I missed it).

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: Thus, the aim of this study was to assess the proximate, distal and intermediate determinants of infant mortality in Ethiopia.

Dear Reviewer, with regard to use of Moses and Chen's framework, we have used it and indicated both in method part as well as the results were presented following fashion in the framework.

Dear Reviewer, with regard to inclusion of only “Proximate determinant” into this title provided that we analyzed data for all three categories of factors was for the following reason. We used Mosley & Chen’s framework since it is too relevant for countries in resource limited settings, including Ethiopia. Accordingly, the decision makers can act primarily on the proxy factors (proximate determinant) for infant mortality in Ethiopia. Although, other scholars have reported number of significantly associated factors with infant mortality in Ethiopia, they failed to indicate proxy factors for policy makers (but it was addressed in this study).

Dear Reviewer, with regard to add the definition for proximal vs distal vs intermediate in the text; the comment is well accepted and we have added the definition accordingly as: Accordingly, proximal vs intermediate vs distal factors were defined as background variables that put influence on infant mortality directly, intermediately and remotely, respectively.

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: relevant intervention strategies that will contribute to reducing the burden of infant mortality in Ethiopia.

Dear Reviewer, with regard to method part, we have added the definition for proximal vs distal vs intermediate in the text; the comment is well accepted and we have added the definition accordingly as:

Accordingly, proximal vs intermediate vs distal factors were defined as background variables that put influence on infant mortality directly, intermediately and remotely, respectively.
23. Comment #23. Line 47. The denominator in all analyses as 2628, which corresponds to the total number of infants born between 2011-2016 and followed up for one year (replace with this text if this is true)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comments accepted and corrections made accordingly as: “The denominator in all analyses as 2628, which corresponds to the total number of infants born between 2011-2016 and followed up for one year,…………”

(Page #5, under methods, paragraph #2, line #7)


Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: from the analysis for birth interval. (Page #6, paragraph #1, line #4)

25. Comment #25. P6 line 14 " of the survey" not " during"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: … of the survey. (Page #6, under study variables, paragraph #1, line #2)


Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the spacing checked and corrected for the phrase “…..due to any cause.”

(Page #6, under study variables, paragraph #1, line #5)

27. Comment #27. Line 35-60: put in paragraph form and write sentences instead of just listing the variables and variable categories. i.e. For the distal factors we considered…

Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comments accepted and corrections are made.

“For distal factors we considered:…….” (Page #6, under predictor variables, paragraph #1, line #5)

“Similarly, variables considered as intermediate factors included: age…”

(Page #6, under predictor variables, paragraph #1, line #5)

“Variables considered as proximal factors included: plurality…….”

(Page #7, paragraph #1, line #3)

28. Comment #28. Line 60. I don't understand what you mean by the fact that birthweight was assessed depending on the mother's age/level of education? Please explain more clearly in the text. Baby's birthweight is the same regardless of how educated the mother is technically..do you mean something else?

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment is well accepted and we have paraphrased the sentence accordingly.

“Baby’s size at birth (birth weight) was assessed by mothers self-report. To reduce the recall bias; mother’s age (young mother’s have good recall) /level of education (more educated mother’s have good recall) and told from physicians during birth were considered.

(Page #7, paragraph #1, line #6-#9)

P7

29. Comment #29. line 1: mothers who “didn't know or could not estimate their infant's birth weight” (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment well accepted and corrections made accordingly as: “Mothers who "didn't know or could not estimate their infant's birth weight were…."

(Page #7, paragraph #1, line #9)
30. Comment # 30. line 12: households "were" not "are"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected accordingly as: “….households were given…”

(Page #7, paragraph #1, line #12)

31. Comment # 31. line 21. Add ref

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and cited as;

“…..component analysis [8].” (Page #7, paragraph #1, line #15)

32. Comment #32. line 21 " were compiled' (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected: “……National wealth quintiles were compiled...” (Page #7, paragraph #1, line #15)

33. Comment #33. line 37: We used Cox regression model in the survival analysis, statistical analyses were performed using STATA version 14 (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected as: “We used Cox regression model in the survival analysis, statistical analyses were performed using STATA version 14.”

(Page #7, under statistical analysis, paragraph #1, line 1)

34. Comment #34. Please add years of birth for the infants included in the study. Did you compile a 5 year mortality rate? (2011-2016), this needs to be written clearly in the text. (I would add in methods, the number of infants born in 2011,2012,2013,2014,2015) and check if there are significant differences in the number of infant deaths in these years)

Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, we found the comment relevant and scientifically sound. We included Childs born between 2011-2015. (Page 5, under method section, paragraph 2, line #4)

But, we didn’t analyze by considering time periods effects/years of birth as we tried to respond for Reviewer’s comment #1.

Comment #35. line 44. Accounts for "censoring" in the data (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections were made accordingly as: “….model is that it accounts for censoring in the data [12].”

(Page #8, paragraph #1, line 2)

35. Comment #3. line 46. "in" the univariate Cox regression analysis

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected as: “….of &lt;0.25 in the univariate…”

(Page #8, paragraph #1, line 3)

36. Comment # 37. line 46-49: Variables with a p-value &lt;0.25 in the univariate Cox regression analysis were included in the multivariate analysis. We estimated hazard ratios and their 95% confidence intervals". In the multivariate analysis, we used p&lt;0.05 as threshold for statistical significance. (replace all)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected as: “Variables with a p-value &lt;0.25 in the univariate Cox regression analysis were included in the multivariate analysis. We estimated hazard ratios and their 95% confidence intervals. In the multivariate analysis, we used p&lt;0.05 as threshold for statistical significance.”

(Page #8, paragraph 1, line 2-5)

P8
37. Comment #38. Line 41. I'm surprised at the number of infants born low birth weight: 31% seems high - could you please check or discuss this figure in the discussion compared to the literature in similar setting - this may indicate bias in mother’s recall (add in limitations).

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected as: “In this study, the number of infants born with low birth weight was much higher as compared to other studies [26,29] and again it was statistically significant for infant mortality. This variation might be due to the recall bias that might be introduced into this study because the size of the child at birth was assessed by mothers self-report.

(Page 17, paragraph 2, line 1-4)

Dear reviewer, with regard to the effect of bias that might be introduced into the study was discussed in the limitation part as: Specifically, number of infants with low birth weight was higher in this study. The assessment of the size of child at birth being depended on mothers self-report might have introduced bias on the actual size of the child at birth.

(Page 17, under limitation part, line 2-4)

38. Comment #39. Tables: replace label to Maternal level of education

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected

(Table 1 and Table 2)

P10.

39. Comment #40. Line 42 the infant survival probability varied by maternal level of education (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrected as: The infant survival probability varied by maternal level of education,...”

(Page #10, under Infant survival status, paragraph 1, line 6)
40. Comment #41. Line 54-59: redundant with methods.
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the redundant part removed
(Page 11, from predictors of infant mortality)

41. Comment #42. P11 line 7-9: sex of the child were included in the multivariate cox regression (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and correction made accordingly as: “……breastfed status at birth and sex of the child were included in the multivariate cox regression.”
(Page 11, from predictors of infant mortality, paragraph 1, line 3)

42. Comment #43. Line 14 ”in comparison” , not ”in relation” (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: “In comparison to mothers…”
(Page 11, distal factors, paragraph 1, line1)

43. Comment #44. Line 19: remove ”Moreover"
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word ”Moreover" removed.
(Page 11, distal factors, paragraph 1, line3)

44. Comment #45. Line 19: was ”lower” not ”reduced” (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word ”reduced” changed to lower”
45. Comment #46. Line 29 "for infants both with a preceding birth interval shorter than 24 months" (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and replacement made accordingly as: “…for infants both with a preceding birth interval shorter than 24 months…..”.

46. Comment #47. line 34 take out "It showed that".

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the phrase “It showed that” taken away.

47. Line 37 take out "for"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word “for” taken away.

48. Comment #49. Line 50 take out "of infants"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word “of infants” taken out.

49. Line 52 take out "size of" (in all other instances as well throughout the text, you can refer to 'small size infants" not "small size of infants")
Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the word “take out ”size of " taken out in all instances.

(Page 12, paragraph 1, line1)

50. Comment #51. Line 57 take out " This was found that "

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Page 12, paragraph 1, line3)

51. Comment #52. Line 4 "Similarly size at birth was significantly associated with infant mortality" (replace line 4-5)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Page 12, paragraph 1, line5)

52. Comment #53. Line 12 " than for female infants " (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Page 12, paragraph 1, line8)

53. Comment #54. Line 16: fitness statistic (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Page 12, paragraph 1, line8)
54. Comment #55. Table 2 skip a line
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

55. Comment #56. Table 2: fix labels "maternal level of education" + Size of infants at birth (add birth weight categories in grams in the table) + Breastfed "at" birth (not upon)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly
(Refer to Table 2)

Discussion

56. Comment #57. P13. Line 52 Replace 'is being emphasized' with "is a global priority"
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as “…is a global priority.”
(Page 14, under discussion, paragraph 1, line 1)

57. Comment #58. P14 Line 16 this study on 'the' proximate determinants (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.
(Page 14, under discussion, paragraph 1, line 10)

58. Comment #59. Line 26 were statistically (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.
(Page 15, paragraph 1, line 1)
59. Comment #60. Lines 32-44: In this study, about 4.8% of infants died before their first birthday. Infant were most at risk during the early months of life which is when approximately, 65% of infants deaths occurred. We found that the infants mortality rate in Ethiopia is relatively higher than the one reported in Tanzania. In Tanzania, about 96% of infants survive their first year, and 56% of infant deaths occur during the neonatal period. This difference could be due to poorer antenatal care practices, and short follow up time for the infants. (replace).

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.

(Page 15, paragraph 2, as a whole)

60. Comment #61. Line 50: In this study, infants of mothers with a higher level of education or secondary education had a lower risk of infant mortality (32 and 41% respectively) compared to the reference category. (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.

(Page 15, paragraph 3, line 1-2)

61. Comment #62. Line 52 Another study conducted (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.

(Page 15, paragraph 3, line 3)

62. Comment #63. Line 58-59 was significantly associated with child survival (replace) which contributes through different mechanisms (not informative).

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly and the non-informative phrase removed away.
63. Comment #64. Line 4: A study by Mustafa et al. showed that Kenyan mothers with a higher level of education have a better socioeconomic status, tend to be more aware of good childcare practices and their child's health status. (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.

64. Comment #65. Line 6-11 this is redundant with results and should not be in the discussion, rephrase and summarize

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the content summarized as: In this study, the risk of infant death with a preceding birth interval shorter than 24 months and longer than 47 months was higher.

65. Comment #66. Line 14 this finding is (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

66. Comment #67. Line 16 less than two years (replace) not "below"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly
67. Comment #68. Line 20-1 in which infants of mothers with a higher level of education were less at risk of dying during infancy (replace) compared to the reference category.

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Pages 15, paragraph 3, line 12-13)

68. Comment #69. Line 27 A previous study conducted using the EDHS2011… (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Pages 15, paragraph 4, line 2)

69. Comment #70. Line 29 "singletons" not singleton

70. Comment #69. Line 27 A previous study conducted using the EDHS2011… (replace)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Pages 16, paragraph 1, line 1)

71. Comment #72. Line 42 "high-risk pregnancies" not births

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

(Pages 16, paragraph 1, line 6)
72. Comment #73. Line 27 "this study also showed that the size of the child at birth was significantly associated with infant mortality" (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly
(Page 17, paragraph 1, line 2)

73. Comment #74. Line 32 showed that small birth size was associated with a (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly
(Page 17, paragraph 1, line 6)

74. Comment #75. Line 37 poor nutritional status may influence size at birth and thereby could affect the risk of infant mortality as well. (replace)
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:
“Poor nutritional status may influence size at birth and thereby could affect the risk of infant mortality as well”
(Page 17, paragraph 1, line 7)

75. Comment #76. Line 40 "was a significant risk factor " not "had significant"
Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:
“…..was a significant risk factor…”
(Page 17, paragraph 2, line 1)

76. Comment #77. Line 42 Another study in Ethiopia (replace)(…) this is also supported by other studies in which (replace)
Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as:

“Another study in Ethiopia…” …”…. “This is also supported by other studies in which..”

(Page 17, paragraph 2, line 2) and (Page 17, paragraph 2, line 4)

P17.

77. Limitations: Authors need to check the reviewers' comments and elaborate more than this on the limitations of the study. Writing line 4 "inconclusiveness of important variables" as a limitation is really not informative - please explain why these were inconclusive using standard epidemiological terms on bias (recall, selection, etc…)

Please also discuss age-period and/or cohort effects in the limitations, and how these might affect the results. Have there been changes in ANC policies between 2011-2015 that might affect differently babies that were born in 2011 vs babies born in the later period.

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the limitation part is summarized as follows.

This study had the following limitations. Some of the variables were measured on subjective basisi or self report of the study participants, thus it can introduce bias. For example the the size of child at birth was assessed by self-report; which might have introduced bias on the actual size of the child at birth. Consequently, the number of infants with low birth weight was higher in this study. Failure to consider time period effects or years of birth into regression might be another source of limitation. The changes of guidelines including the National Strategy for Newborn and Child Survival in Ethiopia between 2011-2015 might affect differently babies that were born in 2011 vs babies born in the later period. In addition, exclusion of observations with incomplete/missing data might have had an effect on the strengths of the associations that we observed, as well as on the accuracy of our estimates as indicated by their confidence intervals

78. Comment #79. Conclusion: please revise language and check for typos and grammatical errors. I have gone through most of the text already, this was quite tedious. Please ensure that all abbreviations are described in the text also.

Authors’ response:
Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and we have exhaustively worked on your comments. Thanks for it.

79. Comment #80. Line 24: "was significantly associated with" not "had significant association"

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: “….was significantly associated with infant mortality.”

(Page 18, under conclusion, paragraph 1, line 5)

80. Comment #81. Figure 1 Flowchart is too succinct and not informative. Please check that the steps described in the Methods section are reflected in the chart.

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and the figure is already removed from the text since the information in the text was informative.

81. Comment #82. Figure 3 Add (Ns) + check title and add how long the follow-up was + years of birth of children included in the study.

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly as: "Fig. 2. The survival status of 2628 infants born between 2011-2015 and followed up to 1 year, 2016 EDHS”

NB: Dear Reviewer, due to the removal of Fig. 1 from the text, Fig 3 was renamed as Fig 2 in this revision.

82. Comment #83. Figure 4. Will you print in color? Because as is the difference between the lines by size at birth is hard to tell. Add medians for survival in each risk category (see http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/BS/BS704_Survival/BS704_Survival_print.html)

Authors’ response:

Dear Reviewer, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly.
The median survival times for infants are also described in the table legend

NB: Dear Reviewer, due to the removal of Fig. 1 from the text, Fig 4 was renamed as Fig 3 in this revision.

Comments of the Editor-in-Chief

Dear Editor, thank you so much for your undivided attention and support throughout this submission.

We have exhaustively revised this manuscript following the reviewers and editorials comments and directives.

1. Be consistent in the name of the survey: Ethiopian Demographic Health Survey versus Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey. Use always capital letter

Authors’ response:

Dear Editor, the comment accepted and “the Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey” consistently used in this document.

2. Do not use abbreviation in the title of tables and figures

Authors’ response:

Dear Editor, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

3. Figure 4: print is in color, use colors with more contrast

Authors’ response:

Dear Editor, the comment is well accepted and the figure changed accordingly with more color contrast as follows.

4. Table 2: Change title to "Relative risk (RR) of infant mortality. Results of a multivariate Cox's Proportional Hazard regression, 2016 Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey

    Change HRs to RR
Dear Editor, the comment accepted and corrections made accordingly

NB: HRs changed to RR throughout this document.

NB: Dear Editor, due to the removal of Fig. 1 from the text, Fig 4 was renamed as Fig 3 in this revision.

4. Table 2: Change title to "Relative risk (RR) of infant mortality. Results of a multivariate Cox's Proportional Hazard regression, 2016 Ethiopian Demographic and Health Survey

    Change HRs to RR