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To BMC Public Health:

This round of revisions included NO major compulsory revisions. Rather, Reviewer 1 had two very small minor revisions which we immediately addressed. Note, we have also incorporated all discretionary revisions even though we are not required to. The reviewers have recommended publishing the article. Note there are no major compulsory revisions. Given that there were no major revisions and the 2 essential revisions were miniscule and have been addressed, we expect to receive speedy notification of acceptance this week from BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. We would like to proceed with the publication of this manuscript without any further delay. Please note that we have submitted all changes within 5 days of receiving the edits in anticipation of speedy publication by the journal.

Point-by-point responses are given below as requested.

Reviewer 1

- Minor Essential Revisions:
(such as missing labels on figures or the wrong use of a term which the author can be trusted to correct).
We have double-checked all figure, table labels, and terms and ensured the text for the figure legend is included on lines 646-651.

Comment on the abstract conclusions: Though the conclusions in the abstract merely restate results, so this could be strengthened by stating specific recommendations or implications. The abstract was corrected on lines 64-65 to add recommendations from the conclusions of the study.

- Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The rationale for the study in the introduction describes the lack of knowledge about risk factors for obstetric complications, compared to maternal mortality. It would be informative to have included some reflection on how this study's findings differ from or are the same as reported risk factors for maternal mortality. If the same, then the programmatic implications regarding increasing ANC, skilled attendance, and FP use are the same. We agree with the reviewer that these study results are similar to risk factors reported for maternal mortality. We have added text comparing the findings of these studies with those for maternal mortality in lines 324-327.

The discussion paragraph about MR and induced abortion makes a good point about the distinction between safe and unsafe abortion. A policy-relevant follow-on study that could be mentioned here would be comparing maternal outcomes for those whose induced abortions were safe or unsafe (defined appropriately with whatever relevant data available). We have added a recommendation for future studies to compare maternal outcomes of women with safe vs unsafe induced abortions in lines 353-354.

Reviewer 2

Overall comments: The authors have appropriately responded to all the queries raised by the reviewers. Where change was not effected a satisfactory explanation was presented. I have a few Discretionary Revisions otherwise published the manuscript.

- Discretionary Revisions
1. Line: 135 Delete was in sentence beginning with “All women with pregnancy outcomes……”. This correction was made.
2. Line: 284 insert the between of and women. This correction was made.
3. Line: 341 Insert the between of and women. This correction was made.

Sincerely,

Shegufta Shefa Sikder, PhD