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Authors’ response to reviews

Dear Editors,

We would like to thank reviewer Joan Morris for accepting the revised version of the paper.

We are pleased to submit our revised manuscript, taking into account all of the minor essential revisions requested by Jane McElroy. Please find our response below, and the revised manuscript with highlighted changes attached for further consideration. We have also checked the manuscript using the manuscript formatting checklist.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Evelyne Muggli
Public Health Genetics
Health behaviour modelling for prenatal diagnosis in Australia: A geodemographic framework for health service utilisation and policy development

**Reviewer: Jane McElroy**

Please find our response below.

---

**Minor essential Revisions:**

**Table 1a/b, why does the proportion of births in each region not add up to 100%?** As indicated on page 7 in the manuscript, segments with less than 1% of all births were not included in the analysis and were therefore not presented in this table. In addition, we only showed one decimal point, which may have resulted in small rounding errors of less than 0.5%.

**Table 1a/b, what is the $ figure for each 0.01 increase in graded household income?** We have amended the footnote to:† *Each 0.01 increase in the ratio of weekly household income reflects an additional A$6.50 compared to the lowest earning segment.*

**Figures 1 and 2, change labelling of y-axis and title of figure, remove decimal point from values on y-axis, add decimal points between 1.0, 1.5 and 2.0 on x-axis.** We have made the first three changes as requested, but have not added any further labelling to the x-axis as we believe this would crowd the figure without adding any further value.

**Page 9 second paragraph, point estimates did not vary significantly from state average as no statistical testing was done.** We have amended the wording in this sentence as follows: *Most point estimates differed markedly from State average.*

**Page 9, second paragraph, next sentence, “The level of prenatal diagnosis in younger mothers reflects uptake of prenatal screening or diagnostic testing paid for through the private health care sector” is an over interpretation of the available data.** We have now added a reference to substantiate this statement: Reference [22]

**Page 9, third paragraph, missing full stop after modelled live birth ratio of DS.** We have added this in.