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To
Melissa Norton, MD
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of BMC series or Pregnancy and Childbirth
BioMed Central Ltd.
236 Gray’s Inn Road, London
WC1X 8HL, UK

MS: 4811879423918786, Women-focused development intervention reduces delays in accessing emergency obstetric care in urban slums in Bangladesh: a cross-sectional study”.

Shamsun Nahar¹, Morsheda Banu², Hashima-E-Nasreen²

Thank you for sending the reviewers comments on our manuscript “Women-focused development intervention reduces delays in accessing emergency obstetric care in urban slums in Bangladesh: a cross-sectional study” (MS: 4811879423918786). These comments assisted us to re-revise and change the manuscript for clarity and quality as suggested. We take this opportunity to thank for their time, interest and sincere suggestions to improve the paper.

Second reviewers needed few clarification regarding method, limitations and terminology of the manuscript and we received few editorial comments. We agree with all comments and have thoroughly reviewed, revised, recognized and the paper to address those concerns (highlighted in the text). These are detailed, point by point at the end of this cover letter below.

We now submit the re-revised manuscript for your consideration and hope that it will meet your favorable decision. Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to improve.

Yours sincerely
Morsheda Banu
Research Associate
BRAC Research and Evaluation Division
(http://www.brac.net/research)
Editorial comments: Thank you very much for your valuable comments on this manuscript.

1. We have systematized to one decimal both in the text and tables (highlighted, on page 13, 15, 16, 17 34, 37, 38 and 39) and also in percentages of figure to meet editor’s concern.

2. Changed p value to $p<0.001$ instead of $p=0.000$, both in the text and tables (highlighted, on page 2, 16, 34, 36, 37 and 39).

3. Used multiparity in the text (page 3, highlighted) and deleted extra space after 7 in page 13 as recommended.

4. BRAC has been formally known as Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee but now days, it is not an abbreviation; only an organizational brand name. However, we have added its formal name in the list of abbreviations with reorganizing the list in an alphabetical order (highlighted, on page 25).

5. Hyphen added and removed ‘etc.’ under the headline of study population as recommended (highlighted on the page 8).

6. Text under inventory of complications and diagnostic symptoms has been deleted according to the second reviewer’s comments from page 10. So, first sentence in the description of eclampsia and the word ‘upside down’ have been simultaneously deleted.

7. Our study populations are those women who had a history of maternal/obstetric complications which is mentioned clearly under the headline of study population (highlighted on the page 8) and added the range of complication per women who had experienced multiple complication (highlighted on the page 13).

8. We have removed extra space after ‘hours’ in the second row on page 16.

9. In table 1: Now we used similar word (pain abdomen) all through the table, however, pain abdomen means abdominal pain (highlighted on the page 33). Source of information added below the table 1.
10. Table 2: According to editor’s concern we have changed the age classification and the class of parity, systematized the use of decimals to one, tried to clear birth spacing, changed stillbirth instead of ‘still-birth’, and corrected the number mentioned in table 2 (highlighted on the page 34).

11. In table 3 and 5 we have corrected the word ‘pre-Eclampsia’ (highlighted on the page 35 and 37) and ‘n-’ arranged in correct way in table 6 (highlighted on the page 38).

12. Table 7: All comments are incorporated accordingly in table 7 (highlighted on the page 39).

Response to reviewer 1: Anthony Mbonye

Thank you very much once again for giving us your valuable time. It is our pleasure that we become successful to meet your queries.

Response to reviewer 2: Pierre Fournier

Let us take the opportunity to thank you and try to meet your concern regarding some issues of this manuscript.

1. As we mentioned how we have selected sample from program’s referral registers on page 9, 24.3% was total number of referral. We tried to clarify in the text under selection of sample (highlighted on the page 9). Hope it will meet reviewer’s concern.

2. We like to clear the confusion regarding obstructed labour, 60% women was not referred for obstructed labour, it was both prolonged and /obstructed labour. Majority of them were referred for prolonged with few obstructed labour; as foetal obstruction is one of the cause of prolonged labour that is why we did not make them separate. We tried to make people understand these complications in table one (highlighted on the page 33) and added ‘and/’ in table 3 and 5 (highlighted on the page 35 and 37).

3. Delay was calculated by questioning respondents about the particular complication listed in questionnaire. Researcher and enumerators asked
diagnostic symptoms presented in table 1 and finally confirmed by ANC card and doctors prescription. We discussed this issue in the text under selection of sample and table 1 (highlighted on the page 9, 33) and 1st delay measurement on the page 11 (highlighted).

4. According to reviewers suggestion we have removed the text under inventory of complications and diagnostic symptoms, we already mentioned above. Some text added in page 10 (highlighted).

5. Issue regarding the recognition by health providers in delivery centres we stated in discussion on page 17 and limitation section at the end of discussion (highlighted on the page 20).