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Dear Editor,

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript 1715364643647281 – ‘Risk factors for adverse perinatal outcomes in imprisoned pregnant women: a systematic review’. We have revised the manuscript in response to comments as follows:

Reviewer 1: A discussion of the preponderance of US studies is included in the discussion section p9 paragraph 3.

Reviewer 2:
Point 1: Study quality issue
a. We have used the approach specified in the Cochrane Reviewers Handbook for non-experimental studies (not intervention studies), and therefore we feel this is a valid method of assessment. Thus performance bias was assessed, as recommended, by considering whether exposure was measured in a similar and unbiased way in the groups being compared (as detailed in section 6.8 of the handbook). Clearly in the case of imprisonment as an exposure, measurement of this exposure is straightforward and we did not feel any of these studies were subject to performance bias as assessed by this criterion. The studies which were graded of lower quality were downgraded because of either selection or attrition bias. We have added clarification that we used criteria for non-experimental studies to the methods section (p4, paragraph 2).
b. We have added a discussion of the quality assessment (p10, paragraph 2).

Point 2: In results
a. As suggested, we have added to the text the percentages greater than 50% from table 3 (p5, paragraph 3).
b. We have discussed the precision of the OR estimates further as recommended (p10, paragraph 3).
c. The source of the heterogeneity of the alcohol results have been added to the results section (p6, paragraph 3).

Point 3: In discussion
a. The imprecise results have been discussed (see above). We feel the assessment of quality used is appropriate and have not included this as a discussion point.
b. The words ‘significant’ and ‘are highly significant’ have been removed as suggested.

Point 4: Table and Figure
a. Table 3 has been modified as suggested.
b. We have not altered the X-axis labels as suggested, as this would be incorrect. This is a graph of odds ratios, and therefore measures risk. The X-axis labels are important to distinguish for the reader between the meaning of an odds ratio less
than or greater than one. The suggested labelling would imply numbers of imprisoned and non-imprisoned pregnant women which is not correct.

Thank you for your further consideration of the manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Marian Knight