Dear reviewers, thank you for reviewing our article and providing us invaluable and crucial comments that helped us to enrich our manuscript. Based on your comments and suggestions, we tried to revise the manuscript and we also provide you point by point response for the comments in the following table and highlighted in the manuscript.

Comments by Reviewer 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Reviewers comment</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The title could read better as “Intention, magnitude and factors associated with bottle feeding practice and intention among mothers of 0-23 months infants and children in Holeta town, Central Ethiopia: Cross-sectional study design”</td>
<td>Thank you, we accept the comment and we modified the title as “Intention, magnitude and factors associated with bottle feeding among mothers of 0-23 months old children in Holeta town, Central Ethiopia: A cross sectional study.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Ethiopia: A cross sectional study.

Background would read better in present continuous tense e.g. World health organization recommends that bottle feeding be avoided for infant and young child feeding.

Thank you, the comment is accepted and we have changed the word ‘recommended’ to ‘recommends’

Page1 line 21 the objectives of this study were to

Thank you, we accept the comment and “was” is changed to were

Line 23 maintain the age 0-23 months for consistency

Thank you, we accept the comment and revise it as mothers of 0-23 months infants and children

State the risk factors clearly in this section as they appear in the findings in the full text. Mothers who did not attend PNC follow-up, mothers with three children under five etc… Cross check your findings to ensure they match and are correctly reported in results section and here in the abstract.

Thank you, the comment is accepted and it is rewritten as ‘Being infant age of 0-5 months [AOR=0.27;95% CI:(0.12,0.62)] and being a housewife [AOR= 0.37;95% CI:(0.21,0.67)] were negatively associated while having three under five children [AOR=2.77;95%CI:(1.07,7.14)], not attending PNC follow-up [AOR=2.13;95%CI:(1.19,4.97)], lower age of mothers [AOR=3.38;95% CI:(1.48,7.73)] and not counseled on bottle feeding [AOR=2.18;95%CI:(1.24,3.83)] were positively associated with bottle feeding. [AOR=2.18;95%CI:(1.24,3.83)] were positively associated with bottle feeding.’

Line 24 sentence starting with “However… should be made clear e.g Breast milk substitutes are used commonly worldwide with bottle feeding which should be avoided due to its impact on optimal breastfeeding.

Thank you, we accept the comment and the sentence is modified as ” However, breast milk substitutes are used commonly worldwide with bottle feeding which should be avoided due to its impact on optimal breastfeeding and appropriate complementary feeding. Moreover, feeding bottles are associated with diarrheal disease morbidity and mortality as it is difficult to
keep them clean especially in developing countries where sanitation is poor.’

The two paragraphs from line 38 to 50 could be merged since they all talk about the prevalence of bottle feeding

Thank you, we accept and merged the paragraphs together.

Line 45, Is there anything special with that region Oromia that makes the mothers bottle feed? This could be stated to add value to the statement

Thank you, we didn’t get any literature which addresses anything special within Oromia region or in the study area that makes mothers to practice bottle feeding compared to other regions of the country. But the study was initiated from an observation that most families in the area are engaged in cattle and dairy production.

Line 52, The authors should state that the study addressed ..... instead of the study tried to address

Thank you, we accept the comment and the comment is incorporated

Line 53, “mothers of children less than two years…”

Thank you, we accept the comment and ‘a child less than two years’ is modified as ‘mothers of 0-23 months infants and children.’

Overall: The background presents literature on bottle feeding and optimal infant feeding practices but lacks information on the gap? Has any study been conducted regarding this topic in Ethiopia to identify the magnitude, intention and factors associated? Why is this study looking at intention? This is not presented in the background

Thank you, we accept the comment and incorporated the following paragraph ‘Although there are some reports or studies in Ethiopia on prevalence of bottle feeding and associated factors [11, 12, 16, 17, 18], there is no any study regarding bottle feeding from the study communities. Besides, research based information is lacking on intention despite the fact that intention is an important predictor to practice bottle feeding in the future.’

The study design is clear

Thank you!

The study setting needs more clarification. Is Holenta a sub urban area? Village? Slum? Add information that can characterize and throw more light on this

Thank you, we accept the comment and clarified the study setting as ‘ Holeta is a suburban area in Oromia region, and found 25km away from Addis Ababa, the capital
area and why you decided to conduct the study in the setting city of Ethiopia. The town has eight kebeles (smallest administrative unit in Ethiopia) and most families in the town are engaged in cattle and dairy production.'

The study population is clear. Take the sampling procedure to the next paragraph on sampling procedure.

Thank you, we accept the comment and the sampling procedure is moved to the next paragraph.

Why did the authors use 50% proportion yet there is a known magnitude of bottle feeding in the same region of 38%?

Thank you for your question! As suggested, the prevalence of bottle feeding is known in some area of the region. We used 50% proportion for the objective to determine prevalence of intention to practice bottle feeding in the future. After calculating sample size for each objectives (magnitude of bottle feeding and intention to practice bottle feeding), the largest sample size was taken for the study.

Give more information of how systematic random sampling was done in the community? How did you identify mothers with children less than 2 years? It is not clear how the participants were recruited

Thank you, we accept the comment and information is added on the article on how we the systematic sampling was done and written as ‘The total number of mothers or caregivers of infants and young children (0-23 months) in each kebele was obtained from the town’s health posts. Then, sample size was proportionally allocated to each kebele and systematic random sampling was used to select study participants. The total number of mothers/caregivers in each kebele was divided by the allocated sample size to get the sampling interval.

Line 25 use “included” instead of “were variable…”

Thank you, we accept the comment and the phrase “were variable…” is changed into ‘included’

Results could be put in past tense, use “had” instead of “have”

We accept the comment and the word ‘have’ is changed to ‘had’

What is the meaning of the results “230(55.0%) stated that bottle feeding

Thank you for your question! This question required the participants to answer if they
was addressed during the counseling session”. Address is a neutral statement. Was bottle feeding taught, discouraged or encouraged? What did the question require of the participants?

were informed about risks of bottle feeding during counseling. 230(55.0%) stated that they were informed about risks of bottle feeding during the counseling session.

The statement is modified as ‘Among mothers who had received advice/counseling on infant and young children feeding, 230(55.0%) stated that they were informed about the risks associated with bottle feeding during the counseling session.’

19 Table 2 should be formatted as table 1

Thank you, we accept and formatted accordingly

20 Table 3: the disaggregated data on prevalence of bottle feeding does not need to be put in the table again

Thank you, we accept.

21 Line 48 and 51: correct the grammar e.g. additional food will be required

Thank you, we accept and changed to Additional food will be required

22 Line 21 page 7. Clarify those findings. Were mothers with three children under five less likely to bottle feed that those with 2 or more? This is confusing. I think from your table of findings, mothers with one child under five were less likely to bottle feed compared to those with three children.

Thank you, we accept and rewritten as mothers who have three under five child in the household were 2.7 more likely to bottle feed than those who have one under five children in the household [AOR=2.77;95%CI:(1.07,7.14)].

23 Table 5: requires formatting, consider removing income and marital status variables since they don’t have multivariate analysis results.

Thank you, we accept and formatted accordingly

24 Generally this section tends to replicate the findings instead of discussing based on existing literature. There need for the authors to give possible explanations for their findings

Thank you, we accept your comments and we tried to add explanation for each finding
Intention has not been discussed, what was the aim of determining intention?

Thank you for the comment. Our objective was to study the prevalence of intention among mothers to bottle feed beside current prevalence of bottle feeding in the study area since we believed that it adds information on the overall practice of bottle feeding. We agree with you it is not well discussed due to lack of literatures but we tried to add some explanations. ‘The reported result was higher than study done in England of which 7% indicated their intentions to practice bottle feeding in the future. High prevalence of intention in the study area might be due to lower awareness level about bottle feeding.’

Page 8 line 40. Add the word percentage to 27.6

Thank you for the comment and modified as 27.6%

There is repetition of results in the discussion. Line 40 and line 49. Please minimize this and instead refer to other literature

Thank you, we tried to minimize from the next paragraph

State what could be the explanation for the prevalence you got in Holeta? Was this expected?

Thank you, we accept the comment and tried to explain it for each paragraph.

Line 22 pages 9: Consider stating the result as “house wives were less likely to bottle feed than mothers working outside the home… then compare, contrast and give a reason for this finding. Consider removing the statistics from this section

Thank you, we accept the comment and it is modified as ‘In addition to this, mothers who were housewives were less likely to bottle feed than mothers who have work outside the home. The result was in line with studies conducted in Mekele town[11], Kenya[20] and Pakistan [23].This might be rationalized as housewives have more time to breastfeed their children or to use alternative feeding methods than mothers who work outside their home.'

The discussion lacks a section on limitations of the study and how they were

Thank you. The comment is accepted and limitation of the study is added at the end
31 Another section to be added is; what new information does this study add to this topic area? Of discussion part of the paper. Thank you, the comment is accepted and the new information gained from this study topic is summarized in the conclusion part of the paper.

32 What are the key findings especially in relation to risk factors that can be modified to improve breastfeeding? The recommendation should be directly originating from the findings of the study. Thank you, your comment is accepted. The conclusion part is modified as follows ‘In conclusion, the prevalence of bottle feeding was higher in the study area when compared with the national prevalence. The number of mothers who had intentions to practice bottle feeding in the future was also high. Counseling on bottle feeding and provision of postnatal care for mothers had positive impact to decrease the prevalence of bottle feeding in the study area. On the other hand, working outside home, lower age of mothers, increased age of infants/children and having more than one under five children in the household were found to be risk factors for practicing bottle feeding. This study therefore underlines the importance of postnatal care follow up and counseling on IYCF including the risks associated with bottle feeding as possible interventions for mothers/caregivers to practice appropriate IYCF in the study area.’

### Comments by Reviewer 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Page 2, Line 27: “More over feeding……in developing countries”. This sentence has some language errors and requires</td>
<td>Thank you, we accept the comment and modified the paragraph as ‘However, breast milk substitutes are used commonly worldwide with bottle feeding which</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modification should be avoided due to its impact on optimal breastfeeding and appropriate complementary feeding. Moreover, feeding bottles are associated with diarrheal disease morbidity and mortality as it is difficult to keep it clean especially in developing countries where sanitation is poor [1].

2 Line 31: Nipple confusion is indeed a crucial hindrance to optimal feeding but this point was not sufficiently followed-up in later section of the paper. The sentence “Avoidance of artificial…breast feeding” could better elaborated in the context of the study area

Thank you, this paragraph is modified as avoidance of artificial teats or pacifiers is a crucial strategy to promote universal breast feeding [6, 7]. Exposure of infants to artificial nipples (bottle feeding) has been strongly associated with breastfeeding problems [1, 6]. This is due to the occurrence of nipple confusion occurs when infants are exposed to two different feeding methods, bottle and breast, resulting in the infant refusing to breastfeed [6].

3 Line 52: Didn’t this study addressed three objectives? 1. Magnitude of bottle feeding 2. Factors associated with bottle feeding 3. Intention to practice bottle feeding? Please reconsider structure of this statement

Thank you. We accept the comment and it is modified as ‘this study was carried out to determine intention, magnitude and factors associated with bottle feeding among mothers of 0-23 months infants and children who live in Holeta town, Central Ethiopia.’

4 Page 3, Line 6: The study was conducted from February to March 2016, but it is written as February to May 2016 in the abstract. Please double check and specify if Feb~Mar is just period for data collection.

Thank you for your comment, February to March 2016 is period of data collection and the study was reported on may, 2016. It is therefore revised as ‘February to May 2016.’

5 Line 27: How was the information on bottle feeding measured?

Thank you, here we wanted to ask the participants whether they were informed from health workers that bottle feeding is not recommended in IYCF. The participants were asked the question ‘Did you get information about bottle feeding is not recommended and risky during
The statement is modified as 230(55.0%) stated that they were informed that bottle feeding is not recommended in IYCF practice during the counseling session.

The Discussion section in this paper can be improved further. Currently, the discussion section is mostly about comparing results with other studies, but readers would like to know why such results were seen in the study area, and what their implications on future recommendation.

The recommendation made in the conclusion are not based on the results from the study, but are merely general comments which could be made without conducting the study. Please reconsider and provide recommendation which are unique to the area.

Thank you, we accept the comment and the discussion part is revised.

Thank you, we accept the comment and this part is revised again.