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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewers comments Actions taken on the manuscript (As per the comment by the reviewers, some part of the manuscript have been updated as mentioned below)

R1: Describe proper method of simple random sampling with proportional allocation

The sampling procedure was fully described in our work. But for the purpose of making it short, it was shortened in our submitted manuscript. However, after the comment the full length of the sampling procedure is added. Here below is what is included;

The district has 31 rural kebeles. All the thirty one kebeles were included in the study. For this study, survey was conducted before the actual study and there were 13,122 under five children. Of these, 115 were found with SAM. So the calculated sample size, 64 cases and 254 controls were selected in proportional allocation to the sample size of each of the 31 rural kebeles using computer generated simple random sampling technique in 1:4 case, control ratio. Totally 318 mother/care giver to child pairs were included.

R1: Elaborate Your results more briefly.

Despite the result was fully displayed on the tables, there was some limitation in narration. As a result the main finding of the tables are summarized above each table after the comment by the reviewer.

R2: Introduction

Introduction needs to be focused

In our submission we have tried to introduce our manuscript using different literatures. After the comment references which are not focused to the title have been updated and replaced with references focused to the title of interest. As a result new paragraphs which are focused to the title have been updated and the reference lists have been updated parallel.
Reviewer 2: Methods

- The method section, like the intro, needs to be re-written. It doesn't provide any information about the study setting or why it was selected (simply mentions the name of the place). Authors also did not provide justification for their selection of the design (why unmatched case control study? why not matched? why not case to control ratio of 1:2 or 1:3? No proper description of the tools used and no proper reference support; how the main outcome variable was measured? What criteria was used? No clear inclusion and exclusion criteria? No justification for selection of the independent variables, etc. In our work, the detail of the methodology was written. However, to make the manuscript short, we have only mentioned some sort of methodology in our previously submitted manuscript. After the reviewers' comment, we have included the detail of the methodology that we have done in our work. The study area why it was selected, the reason for using unmatched case control, the reason for case to control ratio of 1:4, description of the tools used are briefly mentioned with supporting reference and the detail of inclusion and exclusion criteria are included as it appears in our work before first submission.

Reviewer 2: RESULTS:

- Tables are unnecessarily crowded.

- Main findings and trends in the data are not summarized in the text: There was nothing said about Tables 2-4

  In our first submission, all the tables that we did were included but some lacked narration. But after the comment, one table is removed as it is not considered not worth enough. And the main findings of the tables are summarized and narrated above all tables particularly for Table 2 and 3. Nothing is new but simply more description have been given to the tables.

Reviewer 2: Discussion

Authors provided six crowded tables of results but did not discuss their findings properly (less than a page of discussion)

  Similar with the methodology we tried to shorten the discussion in our first submission. However after the comment, the detail of the finding as it appears on our work before tables are included in the main text after the comment in one and half pages.

Reviewer 2: Reference
Very poorly listed--Authors need to follow proper guideline for citing and listing references.

As commented by the reviewer, list of references have been updated as the introduction has been updated. So that some references have been rewritten and list of references have been updated.