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To Regina Kuller & José Guilherme Cecatti

Editors-in-chief,

Reproductive Health

We are pleased to return the paper “Psychological distress as predictor of quality of life in men experiencing infertility: a cross-sectional survey”, following the alterations suggested by the reviewers.

Please find below the suggestions and the alterations made in the manuscript (highlighted in bold):

Reviewer: Marianne Johansson

1) Inclusion criteria in the study are wide, but further in the paper exclusion criteria are mentioned. It’s better with early knowing (Minor): We agree with the reviewer. We have inserted the exclusion criteria immediately after the inclusion criteria, in the Method section. It now reads: “Patients were enrolled if they were seeking investigation for infertility, and if they had been unable to conceive after at least one year of unprotected sexual intercourses. Subjects with scores above the clinical cut-point were excluded from the analyses.”

2) In the paragraph of results there is statistical presentations and discussions, to improve the paper this presentations should be seen in the paragraph of methods so that more can be focused on the results of the study (Major): To address this suggestion, we have moved the statistical comments (i.e., the explanation of multicolinearity test and normality) from the Results section to the Statistical section. As a consequence, we described only the findings in the Results section. The statistical section now reads:” Skewness and kurtosis of the QOL scores were checked to detect important departures from normality. Values between -2 and +2 indicated that no severe departure from normality. This finding was corroborated by the analysis of the normal P-P and Q-Q plots.”

3) A better structure in the paper will improve the manuscript and made it easier for the
readers(Major): We thank the reviewer for this suggestion, and we agree that the manuscript benefited from the re-structuring. We changed the statistical and results section, in order to make them easier for the reader. We had the aim to make the manuscript more digestible.

4) Table I presents socio-economic characteristics, results from BDI, BAI and QOL, total and with four domains. The results from SF 36 is not presented here, missing?(Minor): We had opted not to include the results from SF-36 because of the length of the Table. Nevertheless, we agree that this information is also very important, since we included the SF-36 scores in the subsequent multivariate analyses. We thus included these scores in the Table.

5) Some short words of the meaning of the classification(A,B,C,D)of the Socio-Economic Status could be added (Discretionary): We have included a brief description of the meaning for A,B,C and D in the legend of Table.

6) The subjective perception of infertility etiology and the medical records did not differ, this is interesting. Is this performed to validate? If so, I think you should present it in the design (Minor): Unfortunately, we do not have enough data to perform further analyses on this result. We were only able to run analysis of association (as we did in the manuscript). We believe that this could be further explored in our future projects.

Reviewer: Iracema MP M Calderon

1) add reference for the description of socioeconomic status (Procedures / item 1): We have added a brief explanation of the instrument that we used to assess socio-economic status in the Procedures section. Also, we have added an explanation of the meaning of the socio-economic classification in the legend of the table.

2) in Table 1: would be better to change N (%) OR Mean (SD) by N (%) or Mean (SD), because it can be confused with Odds Ratio (OR): We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have replaced OR for “or” in the Table 1.