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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to comments from reviewers and editor

Dear Editor-in-Chief and Reviewers;

BMC-Nutrition Journal

We have made substantial revision based on the comments that we receive from the reviewers in thought. The comments are well entertained and addressed in the revised manuscript entitled on “Determinants of Malnutrition among Pregnant and Lactating Women under Humanitarian Setting in Ethiopia"

Comment 1: Study participant, design and sampling: Still explanation of qualitative design present

Response: it is a good comment and amended in the current version.
Comment 2: Statistical analysis: Explain what do you mean by significant association, what was the level of p-value was considered significant, and mention the variables that made it into multiple logistic regression analysis.

Response: It is a nice feedback and it is clearly documented in the revised versions. But you can also look at here with some of the points. Variables with a p-value less than 0.05 in bivariate analysis to describe maternal nutritional status and those variables which frequently showed significant association in the previous studies, regardless of the p-value in the current study, were modeled into multivariable logistic regression analysis to assess the determinant. Both crude odds ratio and adjusted odds ratio with corresponding 95% confidence interval were considered to show the strength of association. In multivariable analysis, variables with a p-value of <0.05 were considered as statistically significant.

Comment 3: You mention about selection of variables with significant associations to be included in the multivariate regression, but Table 2 suggests otherwise…all variables were re-run in multiple logistic regressions—rectify this.

Response: it is similar to the questions raised and already addressed in the comment 2 and in the revised manuscript. It is highlighted in detailed manner.

Comment 4. Discuss limitations of this study—this is missing at the end of the discussion section. There are several issues raised by the reviewers’, but also add on generalizability, causality, and that variables included were not exhaustive—for example, food insecurity, feeding practices, diversity, diseases conditions, among others.

Response: it is added in the revised one.

Comment 5. Add on strengths of this study and possibly novelty thereof.

Response: it is a good comment and added in the revised version.

Comment 6. In this section and throughout, mind the spaces between the citations and last word. Some has one space but others have been joined.

Response: It is a good feedback and revised in the new manuscript.
Comment 7. Focus the context to Ethiopia because of the cross-section nature of this study, lack of generalizability, and that it even focused one geographical location of a country

Response: It is a good feedback and revised in the new manuscript.

Comment 8. The second objective has not been reflected in the conclusion

Response: It is a good feedback and revised in the new manuscript.

Comment 9. Focus the recommendations on the factors you found as significant or anything pertinent to this study—the recommendation statement is still broad.

Response: It is a good feedback and revised in the new manuscript.

Kindest regards,