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Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to re-submit a revised manuscript. Please find attached the article entitled "Demographic, socio-economic and cultural factors for fertility differentials in Nepal"

Comments from associate editor and reviewer have been considered and incorporated in the text accordingly with tracked change/underlined and colored.

I trust that the revisions meet the requirements for publication.

Below please find my point-by-point responses.

Yours sincerely,
Ramesh

Response to the Editorial request

Associate Editor Comments:

"The total fertility rate has decreased" on page 3 should read "The total fertility rate (TFR) has decreased"

Response: I have changed accordingly.

Page 3 CBR needs to be explained to reader

Response: I have explained in full.

Page 6 FP needs to be explained in full

Response: I have explained in full.

Page 9 sub-title Discussions should read Discussion

Response: I have changed accordingly.

Reference list


Reference 29 needs publisher and place of publication??

Response: I have added publisher and place of publication.

Editorial requests:
- Please clarify within the Methods section of the manuscript whether the data used in
this study is publically available or whether approval was required for the use of this data?
  
  **Response:** I have added "The data used in this study is publically available" in methods section.

- Please also clarify which specific details related to fertility did you analyse and why?
  
  **Response:** I have added some sentences and underlined for reason.

**Response to the comment by reviewer 1 (Bibha Simkhada) and 2 (Gagan Gurung):**

Thank you very much for your valuable comments in the previous version and recommendation for publication.

**Comment by Reviewer 3: Giorgio Bedogni**

Thank you very much for the valuable comments. The following are the responses of each comment.

**Major compulsory revision**

None

**Minor Essential Revisions**

P1 Abstract/Methods: “to observe” may be replaced by a better term such as “to describe”.

  **Response:** I have changed accordingly.

P2 Abstract/Conclusion and elsewhere: it is not surprising that “no single factor accounts for this high fertility” (or is it?). I suggest deleting this passage here and elsewhere.

  **Response:** I have deleted according to your suggestion.

P3 Background: explain CBR and TFR acronyms.

  **Response:** I have changed accordingly.

P5 Data and Methods / Sampling frame: was data stratification taken into account for analysis? This should be important to maintain the representative ness of the NHDS sample.

  **Response:** The data were weighted to represent the whole population. I have added "Data were weighted to represent the structure of Nepali population using weighing factors provided with the NDHS."

P7 Methods of analysis – I do not understand the passage “the dependent variable (CEB) is in ratio scale”. Are you referring to the outcome variable(s) of ANOVA/multiple regression? They should be considered continuous (and normally distributed, see below).

  **Response:** I have made accordingly. Now it is "the dependent variable (CEB) is in continuous.

P7 Methods of analysis – looking at mean value of CEB in the two age groups, I suspect that CEB is not normally distributed. This may not be a problem with a large sample size
like this but I suggest to report that tests of deviations from normality were performed and their results.

Response: I agreed with the comment that it is not a problem with a large sample size. Furthermore, I have added standard deviation in table 2.

P7 Methods of analysis – although looking at correlation coefficients # 0.6 is a useful way to screen for collinearity, I suppose that more indicative tests such as calculation of variance inflation factors were performed.

Response: I also think this (r>0.06) is a useful way to screen for collinearity. I have used this in this paper. However, there was no multi-collinearity between each pair of independent variables and dependent variable.

P9 Multivariate analysis – in the first phrase of PARA 2 delete “were found” (repetition)

Response: I have deleted repetition word.

P21 Table 2 – explain the * heading. Why not using ** instead of *** as there are apparently no **?

Response: I have explained the * heading. I used the same symbols for both tables (Table 2 and Table 3). If we assign different for these two tables, reader may feel confused.

P22 Table 3 – please make clear that this is a “multivariate” analysis

Response: I have changed accordingly.

Discretionary Revisions

P1 Abstract/Results: consider reporting the regression coefficients in the abstract as they are much more informative than the associated p-values.

Response: I have reported the regression coefficient in the abstract.

P9 Multivariate analysis – it is interesting that one model explains 23% less variance than the other (59-33). Any biologically plausible explanation for this?

Response: First model explain about total women. It explains 59% variance. In the second model I have included the women aged 40-49 only and it explain 33%. All other variables included in the both models are same. Age could play an important role on it. But I didn’t write this explanation in my manuscript.

Once again, thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Regards,

Ramesh Adhikari,
rameshipsr@gmail.com