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Dear editorial board of the Reproductive Health Journal

It is our pleasure to resubmit herewith the manuscript: “Health services for reproductive tract infections among female migrant workers in industrial zones in Ha Noi, Viet Nam: an in-depth assessment”, by Anh Le Thi Kim, Lien Thi Lan Pham, Lan Vu Hoang, and Esther Schelling, as an original research article to the Reproductive Health Journal for consideration of publication. The co-authors have seen and agreed with the revisions of the manuscript. We give you our assurance that the manuscript is not under consideration elsewhere and that it will not be submitted elsewhere until we have received your decision.

We thank the two reviewers and the editor for their constructive comments on our manuscript. Particularly the very detailed comments on the manuscript (and its English) led to a better revised manuscript. Below we reply to all comments made and their consideration in the revised manuscript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers’ comments</th>
<th>Changes in manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs some language corrections before being Published. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes</td>
<td>Thank you for your comments. We have revised all our manuscript and please also see additional information added accorded to reviewer’s 2 comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A. Major compulsory revisions** | We thank you for your suggestions. We have used “female migrant workers” and “in Ha Noi, Viet Nam” instead of “female migrants” and “in Viet Nam” in the title. The new title is “Health services for reproductive tract infections among female migrant workers in industrial zones in Ha Noi, Viet Nam: an in-depth assessment” – Page 1

Page 1
Abstract: should be revised upon revision of the paper. The conclusion in the abstract could be stronger with more specific implications/recommendations/suggestions

The whole background section could be shorten. Last sentence of the first paragraph in page 4 ("Its population grew..."): Specify period/time frame of the population growth

Last sentence in the second paragraph in page 5 ("The majority of female migrants... "): Elaborate on the idea and specify to make it easy to understand as it is difficult to follow

Research objectives of the paper in page 6: The first objective is clear. The second objective is also clear but the authors may want to consider to change 'factors' into 'obstacles' or 'barriers' as the main text of the paper talked specifically about barriers to use and access rather than the 'factors' in general. The third objective of the paper is about the need of RIT information and service but need was thinly discussed in the finding; the findings on need discussed more about inappropriate of current information channel and suggestions for better channels. I would recommend the authors to discuss about the need in greater details or to change/drop this objective. In fact, the paper provided several important findings relating to integration of migrant population to general population and provision of IEC materials; I would recommend the author to elaborate on that and making suggestions/recommendations for more effective IEC activities to migrant population could become an important objective of the paper

Description of RTI symptoms in page 9 ("The RTI symptoms were based on the syndrome approach described in..."): Please summarize the symptoms and specify terminologies used or have them in appendix

First sentence in the second paragraph under the 'Results' in page 10 ("We expected to have... "): Reason for this expectation was not found; given the study setting, i.e. migrant workers in industrial zones, the expectation

Thank you for your suggestions. We was hoping to find some enabling factors in addition to barriers so we used the word “factors” instead of “barriers” but as findings were all about “barriers/obstacles”, we had changed as you suggested.

We agree with your opinion about objective 3. We had drop this objectives but remain the finding about the need to access RTI information among female migrants. Infact, lack of access to information was one of barriers listed for objective 2 results.

Page 6

The description has been specified. Page 9

The section has been revised. Page 2 and 3

The section has been revised. Page 4

The sentence has been rephrased. Page 5

Page 10
was not realistic and hence it was not surprise to found results that did not meet the expectation. The authors may want to consider cutting this expectation and go straight to the findings. Also, specify that 85.6% of the respondents were temporary registered, not just registered.

Third and fourth sentence in the second paragraph under the 'Results' in page 10 ('Still, the living conditions were poor ...'): It is difficult to say whether living conditions of the migrants were poor or not here as non-migrants may have similar or higher share of its population using 'drilled-well water'; high proportion of the study population 'sharing toilets' was also expected as most of them live in dormitories or shared houses.

Under the 'Traditional health beliefs and values' in page 13 are very interesting findings, at least to me, on expected users of the gynecological examination, which is an important barrier to its use among single female migrants. This finding has a strong implication to the increase of the use of gynecological examination among female migrants and should be elaborated more. The authors may also want to consider to change the subtitle of this section to emphasize this important finding.

Again, the whole part on need of RTI information (in page 17) was too thin to stand alone. It was not clear whether there is a high or low need. Furthermore, the information was also duplicated with what was found in the 'traditional health beliefs and values'.

As your suggestion of study objectives, we agree with your opinion about objective 3. We had drop this objectives but we could like to remain the finding about the need to access RTI information among female migrants. Infact, lack of access to information was one of barriers listed for objective 2 results.
Second sentence under 'Discussion' in page 19 ('Age, education, ..... '): Note that the 2004 Migration Survey as well as many other migration surveys in Vietnam did not include migrants in industrial zones

Comparisons with other studies in page 20 and 21 ('There was up to date no report ....') are interesting but it is hard to have any implication from those comparisons given the difference of the study population between this and other studies. The last two sentences in the first paragraph in page 21 ('The fact of higher clinical detection ...could be higher.') are not correct as those findings cannot 'indicate' anything; the difference simply reflects the sample difference between the studies

The conclusion and recommendation could be more specific

The section has been revised. **Page 20**

The section has been revised. **Page 19 and 20**

**B. Minor essential revisions**

Edit, proofread English and use standardized terms. For instance, the third sentence of the first paragraph in page 4 ('In Vietnam, after the period of Renovation (1986), the economic system switched from budget subsidized to market-oriented economy, ...'): 'after the period of Renovation (1986)' should be changed to 'after the introduction of the reforms started in 1986'; 'the economy ...' should be changed to 'the country experienced transition from centrally-planned to market economy'. 'marriage status' in page 9 should be changed to 'marital status'. 'Ethic groups' in Table 1 should be changed to 'Ethnicity' or 'Ethnic group'

Inclusion criteria (last paragraph in page 7) are good but please specify reasons for 6 months to 5 years (?)

First paragraph in page 8: It was showed that 'These migrants were selected randomly from the sampling frame of 1200 migrants ...'. Were those 1200 migrants met all three selection criteria?

Quotes in page 12: They are interesting but do the authors have quotes from female migrants? Such quotes could be more

The section has been specified. **Page 7**

The section has been specified. **Page 7**

Thank you for your suggestion. We have added more codes from female migrants in the section. **Page 12**
important as those quotes were used to support what it was said earlier that 'not all female migrants understand their rights of having health insurance'.

Last paragraph in page 12: The finding is important but it will be more interesting if the authors can show difference compared to non-migrants (?) Without a reference group, it is hard to judge whether 21.6% of the respondents seeking health care center is a high or low proportion. The scope of this study did not allow us to do the comparison with non-migrants group. We acknowledge the reviewer’s comment and will try to implement it in our next study. It is hard to judge whether this proportion is high or low because we don’t have a group to compare to in this study and previous studies in Vietnam was not done among this migrant group. However, it seems to fair to observe that this proportion seems to be low.

The first paragraph in page 15 ("Alike other residents "): Is this implying that female migrants should register at commune health clinics where they live or work instead of district health centers? Thank you for your question. In fact, migrants could register their health insurance at commune health clinics, but not should or must.

The authors may want to include ‘Limitation’ of the study under the ‘Conclusion’ We totally agree with your suggestion and we have added it in the manuscript. Page 22

C. Discretionary revisions

Use pie-chart instead of bar-chart in Figure 1 (?) We think that bar-chart seems to be more visible than pie-chart because there is 5 sub-groups in the figure.

Under the marital status: what about those who got divorced/separated? We acknowledge the reviewer’s comment but in this study we have no distinguish these.

Specify 'Sexual intercourse' as current or ever or what (?) This is from a question that “have you ever have sexual intercourse”

Unfortunately, the manuscript had no chance to be reviewed by an English native speaker. However, we will do it now and right after we have some more comments from referees (if any).

We hope that the editorial board give us an opporuntity to perfectly revise this manuscript.

Sincerely yours,
Anh Le Thi Kim (on behalf of all authors)