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Version: 1 Date: 28 December 2018
Thank you for considering our paper “Factors Associated with Prelacteal Feeding Practices in Debre Berhan District, North Shoa, Central Ethiopia: A Cross-Sectional Community Based Study” (NUTN-D-18-00202) for publication on the Journal of BMC Nutrition. We want to thank all editorial team members and reviewers for their valuable comments on our manuscript. All comments have been addressed properly in the revised paper detail response to all comments follows below.

On behalf of all authors,

Yours Sincerely,

Mesele Damte Argaw, MPH
Senior Health Systems Strengthening Advisor
USAID Transform: Primary Health Care, Ethiopia
JSI Research & Training Institute Inc.
P.O. Box 1392 code 1110, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Seema Puri, PhD (Reviewer 1)

1) Needs editing by a native English writer
Comment accepted: native English writer reviewed the manuscript.

2) The authors have given many references of studies done in the same country on prelacteal feeding practices. So what is the new information which has emerged from this research?

Comment accepted: on paragraph 5th, line 134 to 146: presented the description of the intervention to improve the situation and the importance of this assessment. In addition, this study is conducted in central Ethiopia and in semi urban context.

During the last two decades, the Federal Ministry of Health developed and implemented Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) strategy [14]. One of the main intervention implemented to improve the health of a child is to promote exclusive breastfeeding practices for the first six months of life [15] [16]. The national flagship community health program, which is implemented through health extension workers, promote health through engaging households in the production of their own health [17]. In addition, since 2012, the community health services, enhanced through participatory engagement of Women’s groups called health development army (HDA) responsible to disseminate health information and facilitate uptake of basic health services [18]. Furthermore, the Health Sector Transformation Plan II (HSTP II 2015/16-2019/20) set the goal to achieve about 72 percent of excluding breastfeeding practices by the year 2019 [16]. To achieve this ambitious goal, households will be encouraged and monitored to take up tailored and predefined health promotion, disease prevention, and basic curative interventions. However, considering the implemented interventions and diversified socio-economic characteristics of Ethiopian people, local evidence on prelacteal feeding practices is scarce.

3) In methodology the emphasis is more on data analysis rather than on tools and techniques used. A balance of the two should be achieved.

Comment accepted: On page 5, line 199 to 208, description of tools was presented. Then study variables separately discussed and finally, data management and analysis procedure were described.

Girmay Ayana Mersha, Msc (Reviewer 2)

General Comments

(1) Background section: Poor reference utilization and the background has limited information to show the existing evidence gap

Comment accepted: the background of the study is revised. See above comment 2 and its description.
Method: The method part is not well organized, no logical flow of information as well as activities.

do not mention enough justification to conduct the study. Line 56: it doesn't give sound here. this is others researchers recommendation and you don't need to put at this place. If you think it is necessary move it to its appropriate place.

Comment Accepted: the reference is deleted.

This community-based cross-sectional study was conducted among mother-infant dyads from March through April 2014, in Debre Berhan district, of North Shoa administrative zone, in the Amhara Region. The study area, is located 120 Kilometers away from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia. The study area has an estimated total population of 84,920 people [16]. The study was conducted in four of nine kebeles, the smallest administrative units with 5000 people. The data were part of the study conducted to determine factors associated with exclusive breastfeeding practices in Debre Berhan district, central Ethiopia [17].

I am not sure you are using the appropriate reference in this part, check your procedure in detain.
You are talking about prelacteal feeding and exclude mothers who couldn't initiate breast milk, why?

Comment accepted: all 53 mothers were properly replaced, and the following phase is removed.

“in addition, mothers who have medical or surgical restrictions to initiate breastfeeding were excluded.”

Line 36-47 please re write this paragraph by keeping logical flow of activities from adaptation of tools to data collection.

Comment accepted: the logical flow of concepts and activities are maintained.

Line 49-53 repetition of activities is common, and experience of data collectors and their education status doesn't guarantee the quality of data. Better to write how you make sure to collect quality data.

Comment accepted: repetition of ideals is removed, and the necessary corrections are taken.

Line 4-12 this is not data collection procedure or tool. you should put in the analysis part

Comment accepted and removed.

Result line 26-32 all information in table2 is mentioned here. both are the same. If so you should choose the word description or only the table. But in result wring you should only describe the most important finding from the table.

Comment accepted: the following information was deleted from the paragraphs 3.2 and nd 3.3.

The majority 84.4% of all mothers had institutional deliveries and 99 (15.6%) of mothers reported undergoing home deliveries. Two-thirds 62.6% of mothers received post-natal care services.

79.9% of infants were provided with colostrum. Mothers reported that their weaning practice before six months of age were, 49.2% providing meal rarely and 11.6% were initiated after discontinuing breastfeeding.

Line 37-39, Not appropriate place. this should be in the method section.

Comment accepted: the following phrase was removed.

A logistic regression model was used to examine factors associated with prelacteal feeding practices as dependent variables.

Line 46 not complete information, what does it mean?
Comment accepted: the following phases was added to complete the sentence.

On page line :“than their counter part mothers imitated breastfeeding within an hour”

Discussion In your discussion

1) 1.put your major findings in the first paragraph.

2) 2.then any evidence that support or against your findings

3) 3. Limitation and strength of your study and what was your strategy to minimize your limitation

Comment accepted: the description on the limitation of the study was removed.

5. Limitation of the study

The study design was a cross-sectional community-based survey design; therefore, a cause and effect relationship could not be established.

4) its implication Line 16_you have already mentioned above. repetition of findings here and there is boring for your readers and it doesn't Contribute the the science.

Comment accepted: all repetitions in the manuscript were cleaned and corrected.

Line 28-31 please put your major findings in the first paragraph. you also note that you do not need to discus every findings. please discuss only the major ones.

Comment accepted: the discussions section is revised based on the comment and suggestions.

Recommendation: this recommendation is not emanated from your result.

Comment not accepted: the recommendation is presented based on the results of the study.