

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

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Prevalence of early postnatal care services utilization and associated factors among postnatal women of Wolkite town, Gurage zone, Southern Ethiopia: a community-based cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Lamiso, Yirgalem; Senbeta, Mebratu; Abeje, Seblework; Walle, Fantahun; Tenaw, Shegaw Geze; Derribow, Aberash; Mohamed, Mariama Shifa

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Mulyanto, Joko Academic Medical Center University of Amsterdam, Public Health
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Feb-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I think this study does not the merit to be published in reputable international journal for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The added value of the study is limited. Similar study in low-middle income countries have been conducted and show similar results. The field of study can be considered as "saturated" therefore this study is likely 'replicative' and "statistical oriented" which provide less benefit for wider international audience.2. With relatively small sample size, this study did not provide sufficient information which can be generalized to the broader international audience.3. The author did not provide adequate theoretical framework that they used as a basic approach to the research topic. Study about utilization of healthcare should start from the theoretical framework which can be used as guideline particularly when analyze association between variables that influence utilization. Some theoretical framework such Andersen model can be used as reference.4. The authors did not sufficiently elaborate the findings of the study in discussion section. The discussion section is too "short" which provide limited insight regarding the findings. This make the benefit of this study for the audience become more limited because there is no real "lesson leant" that can be taken by the readers.5. The conclusions were not drawn directly based on the findings. This perhaps caused by the limited elaboration in the discussion section which fail to provide plausible explanation about the results. Without a clear and thorough discussion, it is difficult to develop practical and accurate conclusion and . policy recommendation
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Bayraktar, Burak University of Health Sciences Tepecik Training and Research Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynecology
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for including me in reviewing this manuscript. The article is that “Early postnatal care services utilization and associated factors among postnatal women in Wolkite town, southeast Ethiopia, 2021”. There is another similar study in the same region (It is available in the literature search). In addition, there are similar studies in the same country or different. The discussion section of the article is weak, it consists of only a few paragraphs. Also, the current study does not deliver anything significant new or outbreaking in this matter; at this point, all of this, justifies rejection of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “last 12 months in Gurage Zone “The duration of the study differs with the material method? 2. Why didn't you take 18 and under? 3. Indicate the p value where you calculated the OR in the table and in the text (for example, in the discussion section). 4. I suggest discussing a similar study done in the same place (It is available in the literature search.) 5. Discussion section is weak. There are many articles on this subject in the literature. Please review and compare the underlying factors in detail 6. Please, discuss the meaningful data in more detail. The results of the article have not been adequately discussed as such. The Discussion section consists of only a few paragraphs. 7. Please, indicate your limitations and strengths.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Tilahun, Ruth Dilla University, Midwifery
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>overall the paper is good but need to look at the following again</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. abstract: it lacks introduction 2. introduction ; too shallow and the justification that raised to do this study was inappropriate, and the two studies that the researchers raised was totally in a wrong way....at least they should write confidence interval of the two studies. and correct the grammar in the over ll document
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

REVIEWER 1 COMMENT to the Author:		
1. The added value of the study is limited. Similar study in low-middle income countries have been conducted and show similar results. The field of study can be considered as "saturated" therefore this study is likely 'replicative' and "statistical oriented" which provide less benefit for wider	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Most of previous studies has been conducted focused on PNC (Birth up to 42 days), but early Postnatal care (EPNC) only focused birth up to 7 days, post natal maternal and new born morbidity and mortality is more</p>	

international audience.	common and need attention during this time period, so it is critical period and only few study has been done, therefore it's not saturated and which give more clue for wider international audience.	
2. With relatively small sample size, this study did not provide sufficient information which can be generalized to the broader international audience.	Thank you The sample size was scientifically calculated.	
3. The author did not provide adequate theoretical framework that they used as a basic approach to the research topic. Study about utilization of healthcare should start from the theoretical framework which can be used as guideline particularly when analyze association between variables that influence utilization. Some theoretical framework such Andersen model can be used as reference.	Thank you All variables in the study selected from previous studies, including studies those used Andersen model.	
4. The authors did not sufficiently elaborate the findings of the study in discussion section. The discussion section is too "short" which provide limited insight regarding the findings. This make the benefit of this study for the audience become more limited because there is no real "lesson leant" that can be taken by the readers.	Thank you Corrected in the document	#20 &21
5. The conclusions were not drawn directly based on the findings. This perhaps caused by the limited elaboration in the discussion section which fails to provide plausible explanation about the results. Without a clear and thorough discussion, it is difficult to develop practical and accurate conclusion and. policy recommendation	Thank you Corrected in the document	#22
REVIEWER 2 COMMENT		
1. "last 12 months in Gurage Zone "The duration of the	Thank you	#6

study differs with the material method?	Corrected in the document	
2. Why didn't you take 18 and under?	Thank you In order to minimize information bias and concerned to Ethical issue.	
3. Indicate the p value where you calculated the OR in the table and in the text (for example, in the discussion section).	Thank you Corrected in the document	#8 &19
4. I suggest discussing a similar study done in the same place (It is available in the literature search.)	Thank you Corrected in the document	20 &21
5. Discussion section is weak. There are many articles on this subject in the literature. Please review and compare the underlying factors in detail	Thank you Corrected in the document	20 &21
6. Please, discuss the meaningful data in more detail. The results of the article have not been adequately discussed as such. The Discussion section consists of only a few paragraphs.	Thank you Corrected in the document	# 20 &21
7. Please, indicate your limitations and strengths.	Thank you Corrected in the document	#21
REVIEWER 3 COMMENT		
1. abstract: it lacks introduction	Thank you Corrected in the document	#2
2. introduction ; too shallow and the justification that raised to do this study was inappropriate, and the two studies that the researchers raised was totally in a wrong way....at least they should write confidence interval of the two studies.	Thank you Under discussion we add another study in the discussion rather than to write CI Corrected in the document	21& 22
3. And correct the grammar in the overall document	Thank you Corrected in the document	Overall document

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bayraktar, Burak University of Health Sciences Tepecik Training and Research Hospital, Obstetrics and Gynecology
-----------------	---

REVIEW RETURNED	11-Jun-2022
------------------------	-------------

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors made significant changes in the revision. However, I still think that there are similar articles with large sample numbers in the literature. This more local work does not provide much different content.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 2	AUTHOR RESPONSE	PAGE NUMBER
The authors made significant changes in the revision. However, I still think that there are similar articles with large sample numbers in the literature. This more local work does not provide much different content.	Thank you We used scientific method to get sample size for this study	Page # 6 and 3