**Comments from Editor**

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

**Response: We provide a Response to Reviewer file including all point-by-point responses to the comments.**

2) Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.

**Response: Thank you, we keep track of changes following the manuscript.**

3) Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements

**Response: Thank you for your comment. We followed the submission guidelines and figure resolution requirements and make changes to the figure resolution.**

Reviewer 1:

* Page-9, (data..) there should be one dot.

**Response: Thank you. We fixed this. Page-9.**

* Page-5, In Bangladesh, government &amp;” change the short form into written format.

**Response: Thank you, we change the term ‘&’ into ‘and’. Page-5.**

* Why didn’t you weighted the data, I cannot understand. Weighted prevalence is suggested.

**Response: Thank you, for your valuable time for this comment. We include weighted data in all analyses, and we clear it by “We employed survey weight in all analysis by design features like the primary sampling unit (PSU), stratum, cluster, and sample weight with the Svyset command”. Page-9. Also, we mentioned below Table.2.**

* What is the need of chi-square test since you have used unadjusted model, please justify the importance of using chi-square test.

**Response: Thank you. We removed the unadjusted model and their P-value which provides the same meaning as chi-squared test. We put the unadjusted model findings in a supplementary file.**

* How did you select the factors for final model is not clear to the paper since you run two same analyses.

**Response: Thank you for your comment on selecting factors. We define in the Variable selection, “Variables were selected in two stages. In the first stage, bivariate analysis (chi-square test) was conducted separately for each of the 26 variables. In total, 18 (MICS 2012) and 14 (MICS 2019) variables were selected by using 5% level of significance for adjusted logistic regression model (Table 3).”. Page-9.**

* What is the power of the statistics you used?

**Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. For the power of the statistics, we provide the plot of ROC curve as in manuscript and a table in supplementary file. Also, added ‘Model performance’ paragraph in method section. Page - 10**

* The rationality of the study is somewhat week, please make a strong ground in the introduction section.

**Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We revised our introduction to overcome this issue.**

* “A strong impact of the child’s age, region, division, mother’s education, wealth index, religion, childhood education program, nutritional status, supervision and child punishment on the child’s developmental status was detected.”  I suggested to remove this from the conclusion because this is main findings, and you repeated it.

**Response: Thank you. We remove this sentence.**

* **“**We are grateful to the UNICEF MICS team for providing us with the data.” please finish the line with dot.

**Response: Thank you, we fixed this.**

* I would suggest to run multi-level modelling because there may have some cluster effects as shown by your sampling technique.

**Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We applied multi-level model in all logistic regression model.**

* Major problems in the study I found no comparison in the prevalence of ECD, please see the suggested paper (Table 3: [https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/11/12/e057896)](https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/11/12/e057896)%C2%A0)

**Response: We made change in the Table. 2 title “Comparison of the prevalence of early childhood developmental status, MICS 2012 and 2019”.**

**Reviewer 2:**

* In the abstract, results reporting should be revised. Sentence makings are mostly incorrect and somewhat lacking readability.

**Response: Thank you for your precious comment. We make the correction of reporting results and re-arrange the sentences by checking Grammarly.**

* Introduction section also needs major revision. Information are there, but are not arranged coherently.  Both present and past tenses are used; some sentences are missing verb.

**Response: Thank you. We revised our introduction section and corrected the tense issues.**

* The first appearance of MICS and LMICs in the introduction needs elaboration.

**Response: Thank you, we made these changes the elaboration in the first appearance. Page-4.**

* Citation should be done correctly; for example, “according to [16]” is incorrect.

**Response: Thank you, we correct this by [16].**

* Chai square and univariate logistic regression give equivalent results. Use of both is unnecessary. Chai square followed by a multivariable logistic regression is enough for finding factors of a certain phenomenon.

**Response: Thank you for your precious comment. We took this seriously and removed the univariable model and put that in supplementary file. As we mention in the previous comment, we keep only chi-square results, then applied multivariable model.**

* The language of result section should be improved. Br careful of using the word “both”.

**Response: Thank you, we made change the word “both” into “two consecutive”**

* A statement of results should be a statistical statement. When the test is insignificant, it cannot be said one category is higher (lower) than another.

**Response: Thank you. We remove the interpretation of the factor as Mother stimulation, which was not significant.**

* Information of Fig 3 is repeated in Table 1. Frequent use of figures in parenthesis decreases the readability. Too many use of such floating number do not allow the reader getting information smoothly.

**Response: Thank you, we removed the Fig 3, Page-11.**

* Coherency is again missing in the discussion section. Some irrelevant literature are accommodated. Some sentences do not have clear meanings.

**Response: Thank you. We removed some irrelevant literature.**

* Authors should careful about the words they use. Gender difference and gender inequality cannot be always treated as synonym.

**Response: Thank you for your nice work, we made change the word “difference” into “inequality”. Page-15.**

* Conclusion section does not go with the results obtained. Insignificant variables are reported as significant factors.

**Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We removed this insignificant variable report from the conclusion. Page-19.**