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Author's response to reviews: see over
Authors wish to thank for your valuable comments of Referees on the manuscript MS: 1173004261177120. The answers are as follows:

Please find attached the revised copy of this manuscript. All the changes are highlighted in yellow color in the text.

**REFEREE 1.**

Abstract
1. Accurately describe the sample. It was not "randomly selected". It is revised as stratified random sampling in the text.
2. Clarify if the 204 physicians "opposed to abortion" means opposed in respect of all the three conditions mentioned.

We describe it in the result part of abstract section and also in the result part. (page 2 line 11-16)

3. Clarify the meaning of the separate percentages relating to months of gestation.
   - We change the "opposed to abortion" to opposed in respect to all of the three diseases so the number were changed and also we clarified the exact gestational age. (page 2 line 14-18)

Introduction
4. The published studies first introduced in the Discussion should be moved to the Introduction. The Nourup and Rett references are unrepresentative of the literature, so this section should either be expanded or dropped.

   We moved it into the introduction. (page 3 line 19-20)
   - Also, we expand Nourup reference (page 7 line 14-17)

   And omit Rett reference as you wish.

Materials and Methods
5. Give brief details of the sampling frame, and practical information about how the survey was conducted.

   We explained sample frame in the material and methods. (page 5 line 13-16)

Results
6. How representative was the achieved sample in terms of gender, seniority and departmental affiliation?
They were working on different department of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences with different sex, degrees and were belonged to the different parts of Iran. The result was not important in view point of gender. They also clarified in the text. (page 5 line 15-16)

7. Were response options mutually exclusive?
   Yes but in some of our questioners, we had multiple choices.

Discussion
8. The last sentence of the first paragraph does not make sense: the discrepancy between the two studies needs clarifying.
   It was corrected in the text. (page 7 line 8-10)

9. The final sentence needs modifying, as the direction of cause and effect cannot be established.
   It was corrected in the text. (page 8 line 13-17)

10. Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published.
   We gave this article to the editor (international Science Editing Co.) that your journal suggested us & they edited it for us.

REFEEEREE 2

Methods
The report would be considerably strengthened by including a statistical analysis of the results. The methods indicate that chi square and Fisher’s exact test were used but the results are not included in the paper.
   We made a mistake in typing. So, It was corrected in the text. (page 5 last line)

It would be helpful to give a response rate. While the data are included in the paper in their raw format, an overall estimate would be useful.
   We corrected it in the text. (page 5 line 13-16)

Data
There is a lack of clarity in how the results were analysed. Of 323 participants the majority appeared to support termination for two of the conditions. The results state that 204 physicians were opposed to abortion which appears to undermine the first statement. It may be that the authors have conflated the results for the three conditions. If so, I suggest that the results of those opposed to abortion should be given by condition. The paper states that the majority of physicians were in favour of abortion but when this is broken down by gestation the response add up to about 16%.
   We revised all the data completely as you requested. (page 6 line 11-17)
Discussion and Conclusion
The reasons for the responses given were not explored in this study and therefore the conclusion that physicians support abortion for thalassaemia and Down syndrome because of the overall prognosis of the condition are not supported by the data.

We added it in the introduction section. (page 3 line 19-20)
In Conclusion, we revised it. (page 8 line 12-17)

In the discussion the view’s of healthcare professionals in this study are compared with other studies reporting the views of women about termination of pregnancy. I would suggest that the authors compare the views of healthcare professionals in this study with other studies examining the views of healthcare professionals towards termination of pregnancy for these conditions. There are differences between the view’s of women and healthcare professionals but the design and reporting of the current study is not sufficiently robust for this to be the main focus of the discussion.

We added some references and compared them. (page 7 line 11-17)

These results are from one university in Iran. It would be helpful to consider how generalisable these results are to the rest of Iran.

They were working on different department of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences with different sex, degrees and were belonged to the different parts of Iran. The result was not important in view point of gender. They also clarified in the text. (page 5 line 15-16)

Limitations
A section on limitations and strengths would be helpful.

We added this section before acknowledgement.

Title
This adequately reflects the paper. However the conclusion of the abstract goes beyond the supporting data.

We corrected it
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