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The Editor-in-Chief

BMC Public Health


We thank the Editorial team and the Reviewers for the kind consideration being given to our manuscript. We have read through the insightful comments of the Reviewers and revised the manuscript according to their suggestions. All corrections have been highlighted within the manuscript using the Track Changes software.

We highlight in the following pages our response to the specific comments of each Reviewer.

Sincerely,

Fawole Bukola

On behalf of Authors
Reviewer 1

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Under Statistical Analysis 4th line 't' missing from 'he'. "we determined ..he"

   Response

   We have revised accordingly.

2. Under Results 2nd line there should be a space between 'were' and '81,941'

   Response

   We have revised accordingly.

3. Under Results line 21. the sentence 'the distribution of women in the different categories and frequency of perinatal deaths as shown in table 3' may be better phrased. When one goes to table 3 the title of the table is different and reflects the distribution of pregnancies with or without complications rather than women.

   Response

   We thank the Reviewer for the comment. We have changed the sentence to reflect the title of the Table. We also wish to state respectfully that in explaining this Table, we had used the terms ‘women’ and ‘pregnancy’ interchangeably.
Reviewer 2

A major compulsory revision to be made is that limitations of the work must be clearly stated.

Response

We thank the Reviewer for this important observation. We have incorporated comments about strength and weakness of the study on Page 15.

Minor essential revisions are:
P3- penultimate line should be rephrased thus-.......had indications but labour was not induced.

Response

We have revised accordingly.

P4- Under key words-unmet need NOT un-met need. This spelling should be consistent throughout the manuscript.

Response

We have made the corrections. ‘Unmet need’ is now used consistently throughout the manuscript.

P4-line 5-do you mean"level of antenatal care"?

Response

Response

Yes please. Correction has been made.
P6-line 6- change the word "connection" to "context".

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.

P8-line 17-Under Statistical Analysis- (t) he rates of induction.

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.

P11- line 15-"was noted" not "were noted".

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.

P12-line 1-"a" huge unmet need

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.

P12-line 3 -severe anaemia "and" other medical conditions.

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.

P12-line 10 ..........induction of labour was"relatively" high.

**Response**
We have revised accordingly.
P13- line 18- "in" not "on" primary health care facilities.

Response

We have revised accordingly.