

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Understanding the traditional values and use of Okra among pregnant women in western Ethiopia: A qualitative study.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Negash, Efrem; Belachew, Tefera; Tamiru, Dessalegn

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Magalie El Hajj Partners 4 Health Ltd
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	26-Feb-2023

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This paper is very interesting. However, I do have some comments and suggestions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) I fail to see the clinical impact and implications of the results. Please discuss them in the Discussion section.</li><li>2) Moreover, the results may be biased by the lack of education in most study participants and the fact that the vast majority of the study participants were Muslim. Please discuss this.</li><li>3) Present the study limitations.</li><li>4) Present data on the safety and toxicity of okra in pregnant women.</li></ol>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Aljawharah Alqathama Umm Al-Qura University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	28-Feb-2023

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The aim and hypothesis of the study were not clearly defined in the Introduction. The content of the Introduction does not appear to link in any way to the purpose of the study. The Abstract need to be rewritten. As the study was conducted in western Ethiopia, rather than Ethiopia as a whole, the title of the study should reflect this. Research in a single area of the country cannot be generalised to all of the pregnant communities in Ethiopia. How was the agreement of the study participants obtained? The title and stated objectives of the study refer to the use of okra by pregnant women. However, your research questions and the results do not relate directly to pregnant women, but rather to all women in the area you studied. You therefore need to be clear what the aim of your study is and to match it with the demographics of the participants so that it makes sense. In the whole of the manuscript only one paragraph (428-434) and two lines of the Conclusion mention the benefits of okra in pregnancy. The research aim and</p>
-------------------------	---

	questions should therefore be revised and checked for logical coherence with the methodology, results, findings, and conclusion.
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Gebi Agero Arsi University College of Health Sciences, Public Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	03-Mar-2023

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Dear Authors Thank you for addressing a topic of paramount Importance. The topic is very essential for meeting household food security specifically in LMICs.</p> <p>Specific comments will be as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The use of abbreviation and acronym is not costmary in abstract unless otherwise permitted by the journal's guideline (Page 2 line 39 and 47).</li> <li>2. Page 3 line 105, Okra was first introduced in Ethiopia..... Here its better to follow chronological (either deductive or inductive) order, hence this part of the introduction must be after narration of all other evidences.</li> <li>3. Page 6, Line 129 households in rural areas, which rural areas??</li> <li>4. Page 7, Line 166 and 167 .....very high (16%) compared to national .....(23%) is not high unless there is statistical meaning attached to it.</li> <li>5. Page 9, Line 236 and 237 .....where interpreting the content of the themes and sub-themes was carried out?? is not clear.</li> <li>6. Page 10, Table 1; Data collection tool, better to make it 'Data collection Method or Approach'. Better to remove the decimal place of the absolute number. From the same page I didn't see any abbreviation in the table and the need to have the key below the table.</li> <li>7. Page 15, Line 384 .....them, better replaced by it</li> </ol>
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

#### ❖ Responses to Reviewer 1:

1. Thanks for your critical concern. The clinical impact and implications of the results were incorporated in the discussion section. As scientific evidence indicated, okra is used to promote a healthy pregnancy. An incredibly essential vitamin B for creating and maintaining new cells, foliate is a vital substance for optimum pregnancy. The vitamin aids in preventing birth defects just like spine bifida and enables the baby to develop completely. Vitamin C is additionally required for baby development. Okra is full of both foliate and vitamin C. Foliate is a vital nutrient that increases the growth and development of the foetus brain. The high quantity of folic acid within Okra performs a huge role in the neural tube formation of the fetus through the fourth to the 12th week of pregnancy. Therefore if pregnant women utilized different parts of Okra, all those clinical benefits will be obtained.
2. Thanks for your concern. As indicated in the result section of the study, the majority of the indigenous communities of rural western Ethiopia were Muslim religious followers unless they changed their religion. Even in our cases, of the total study participants, only three of them were Orthodox religious followers who changed from Muslim ones. In line with this, most of them were not attended formal education as indicated in our study. This could be due to

sociocultural factors in the community, their attitude towards formal education or it could be the perceptions of the gender roles in that community as most of the females take many responsibilities in maintaining household food security.

3. The study limitations were presented in the discussion section of the main manuscript.
4. There was no published evidence on the safety and toxicity of okra in pregnant women. Our study was a baseline data.

❖ **Responses to Reviewer 2:**

1. Thanks for your valuable and scientific comments. As per your suggestion, the aim and hypothesis of the study were modified and defined in the introduction to link it to the purpose of the study.
2. The Abstract was rewritten to reflect or address the aim of the manuscript.
3. Thanks for your suggestion. The title of the research must be specific. In our case, we conducted this study only in western Ethiopia. Therefore, as per your suggestion, the study area in the title of the study was rewritten as “western Ethiopia” rather than Ethiopia.
4. We appreciate the most critical and scientific comments you provided for our manuscript. Therefore, the agreement of the study participants and all related ethical aspects of the study were presented on page number 16-17 of the main manuscript.
5. Thanks for your critical and scientific comments. Based on your comments, we incorporate the important modifications concerning making coherence between the title, objectives, methodology, results, findings, and conclusion of the study.

❖ **Responses to reviewer 3:**

1. Thanks for your comment. We already remove the abbreviation and acronym in the abstract.
2. Thanks for your scientific and critical comments. As much as possible we followed the chronological order of evidence while we used evidence.
3. We apologize for the ambiguity we made. The statement was rewritten as "Households in rural areas of the world".
4. We have rewritten and modified the word "very high" as "nearly comparable to". Thus, this was presented in the main manuscript.
5. We tried to interpret the content of the themes and sub-themes on pages 10-13 of the manuscript.
6. As per your suggestion, the data collection tool written in table 1 was replaced with 'Data Collection Method. In line with this, the decimal place of the absolute number was also removed. From this table, abbreviations were used under the data collection method as "FGD and IDI" which is why the need to have the key below the table was important.
7. We apologize for the type error. As per your suggestion, we replaced it.

**VERSION 2 – REVIEW**

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Magalie El Hajj Partners 4 Health Ltd
-----------------	--

<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	12-Mar-2023
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Thank you for responding to all the comments. As a minor comment, I suggest to proofread the article to fix any spelling or grammar mistakes.
<b>REVIEWER</b>	Gebi Agero Arsi University College of Health Sciences, Public Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	22-Mar-2023
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	All comments are well addressed.