

Reviewer's Comment:

The authors have modified the papers and condensed into 1; they have not improved on the analysis and still have not sufficiently addressed the issue of sampling. At the first level they need to say how the health centres were sample? Basically x out of y, z in rural areas and w in urban etc to demonstrate how representative the sample of facilities is of the region. Next is how the women were sampled. They stated randomly but how - every other one on a certain day or all those within an hour or randomly from a list? More information is required if the sample is to be deemed representative.

There are also some editorial errors.

Authors Feedback:

1. Both papers are submitted in different journals and are not condensed into a single paper.
2. Analysis has been improved in the reviewed paper submitted to IJTDH for final evaluation.
3. Two public and three private healthcare centers were sampled during the study (L57 of the reviewed paper submitted to IJTDH for final evaluation).
4. Research was done only in urban areas i.e. the healthcare centers used in this study are located in urban areas
5. Sampling of the pregnant women attending antenatal clinics in this study was done by systematic random sampling (L59 of the reviewed paper submitted to IJTDH for final evaluation).
6. Editorial errors have been corrected in the reviewed paper submitted to IJTDH for final evaluation.

Thank you for your comments and suggestions, which improved the quality of this manuscript.