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LETTER TO THE REVIEWER MARGARETA LARSSON

We have taken into account all your comments and suggestions and incorporated them in the new version. Please, find below the point-by-point explanation of the changes we have done. We follow the same order that you used. The changes in the new version of the manuscript are written in bold font.

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. We have defined FP in the methods section, where the questionnaire is explained (page 5, line 23; page 7, lines 8-13)

2. We have completed the information regarding other factors that influence women’s choice in the Results section (page 10, lines 4-11). According to your suggestion, we have included more comments about this issue in the Discussion section (page 14, lines 7-21).

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. Conclusion
   The sentence has been changed.

2. Key words
   According to your suggestion, we have deleted “pill” and also “family planning”. However, we have added the terms: “oral contraceptives”, “emergency contraception” and “intrauterine devices” because, according to available evidence, they can sometimes work after fertilization (see references 2-12 in References section) and we considered important that people who work with these specific 3 family planning methods can reach our study through these key words.

3. Methods
   We have clarified that the centre where the pilot study was carried out was included among the study sites (page 6, lines 4-6).

4. Results:
   Response rate
   We have now clarified the calculation of the response rate (page 9, lines 8-15). We do not have more information about women who chose not to participate than what is explained in our paper. We have added more information about sample size in Methods section (page 5, lines 14-21).
Technical school
We have clarified this issue of the educational level in the Table 2 and the Table 4 of the new version (bottom of table). We have changed the term school by college. With the term “technical college” we meant a college offering students courses in technical and other subjects after they have left school.

Marital status: separated and divorced women
Not all separated and divorced women were single, but we wanted to distinguish the single and never married women from those that may be single but have been married (placed in the other group).

Religion
None of the participants were Muslim, Hindu or Buddhists. We have added this information in the Results section (page 25, last line).

Table 2 (Table 3 in the new version)
According to your suggestion, we have exchanged “belief” by “opinion”.

Discretionary Revisions

Abstract
We have decided to write the exact figures of the tables (with or without decimals), in order to be consistent with the results shown in tables.

Methods
According to your suggestion, we have rephrased the sentence (page 8, lines 12-18 and page 12, lines 5-7)

Discussion
We have changed this part of the discussion, according to the other reviewer’s comments.

Tables:
We preferred to present estimates with their respective CI to show the degree of precision of our estimates (explained in Methods section, page 8, lines 11-12).
LETTER TO THE REVIEWER MELANIE GOLD

We have taken into account all your comments and suggestions and have incorporated all of them to the new version of the manuscript. Please, find below the description of the changes we have done, detailing point-by-point each answer to your comments and indications. We followed the same order that you used. The changes in the new version of the manuscript are written in bold font.

Detailed comments for authors

Title
According with your suggestion, we have added “in Pamplona, Spain”.

Abstract
1. Questionnaire
According to your indication, we stated that the questionnaire used in this study is about family planning methods and about medical and surgical abortion

2. Methods
We have exchanged the word “concerns” by the word “beliefs” or “decisions” in the new version of the manuscript.

3. Results
The wording of the sentence has been changed

4. Conclusions
The sentence has been changed

Manuscript
“A sample of 725 fertile women”
We have changed the sentence and clarified this issue (page 5, line 4 and lines 8-13). We have also included the women who chose not to participate, so the total sample size is 755.

Religious affiliation of the Health care centres
We have clarified it (page 5, lines 7-8)
Reading level for the questionnaire
We have not measured the reading level. However, the pilot study performed on women similar to those who answered our questionnaire, showed that the questions were appropriated and understandable by them. As it has been explained in the text, there were some inconsistent responses (12.2%), indicating that some women could have misunderstood some questions. As explained in the method section, results did not change when women with inconsistent responses were excluded.

English version of the questionnaire
It will be available from the authors upon request (page 7, line 23)

Exact definitions from the survey for stages 1, 2 and 3
This information has been added in page 6, lines 10-22

Distribution of the questionnaires and incentives
It has been clarified in page 7, last line

Repeated participation
It has been added information about how we avoided repeated participation (page 8, line 4-9)

Term “concerns”
This term has been changed thorough the text

Key questions of the questionnaire
We present them in new Table 1

Potential fertility
Clarified in Methods section, page 5, lines 10-13.

Religiosity
We have added some figures about this variable (Result section, page 9, lines 23-25) and more information about this variable in Methods section (page 7, lines 13-18 and line 21).
Natural loss
According to your suggestion, we have further discussed the issue of the use of the term natural instead of spontaneous and the possibility of different interpretations of the question 8 (page 15 and page 16, lines 1-2)

The term “embryo loss” is included and defined in Pubmed (Mesh). During the development of the questionnaire we were not aware that this may introduce possible bias. Having said this, we do like your proposal of using “sometimes a fertilized ovum or an embryo does not continue to grow for a variety of reasons. Sometimes this happens on its own and sometimes medication, like a contraceptive method, may cause this to happen” instead.

We also have added the exact wording of question 8 in the new Table 1.

How often a method works at stage 2 and stage 3
We have added some figures (page 11, lines 1-2)

Inconsistent responses
We have clarified this in Results section, page 9, lines 16-18

Terms that could potentially result in biased responses
We have revised and changed the sentence (page 16, lines 8-12).
We agree that the term “destroy” could have a negative meaning to the respondents and we would not use this term in the future as suggested. However, we think that this is unlikely to substantially affect our results. Although importance of wording is generally stressed in the literature, the findings regarding its effect are scarce and partly contradictory.

Important characteristics of family planning methods:
We have included this information in the new version (Methods section: page 7, lines 2-6; Results section: page 10, lines 4-11 and Discussion section: page 14, lines 7-21)

Set of question to ask women
We have further discussed this issue in page 16, lines 22-25 and page 17, lines 1-8
Table 3
New Table 4. We have changed the term concern

Table with the wording of the key questions
It has been included as Table 1

Comments on the Questionnaire

Definition of family planning method
We have clarified this issue in Methods section, page 7, lines 8-13

Exact definitions from the survey for stages 1, 2 and 3
This information has been added in page 6, lines 10-22

Embryo loss
According to your suggestion, we have further discussed the issue of the use of the term natural instead of spontaneous and the possibility of different interpretations of the question 8 (page 15 and page 16, lines 1-2)

The term “embryo loss” is included and defined in Pubmed (Mesh). During the development of the questionnaire we were not aware that this may introduce possible bias, see above.

Explanation about stages
We have further discuss this issue in page 15, lines 20-26 and page 16, lines 1-2

RU-486 and abortion
We have clarified this issue in the text (Methods section: page 5, line 23; page 7, lines 8-13)