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Dear Editor,

Thank you for providing feedback on our trial protocol: ‘MOBILE Technology for Improved Family Planning Services (MOTIF): a randomised control trial protocol.’

We would like to extend our appreciation to the editors and reviewers for their constructive criticism and thoughtful comments that have been greatly helpful for the improvement of our manuscript. Enclosed are the point-by-point responses to the editor’s and reviewer’s comments and the revised manuscript.

All authors approve the resubmission. Please let us know if you need any additional information.

We have addressed the discretionary revisions in the attached manuscript and the changes are highlighted yellow, together with a couple of ‘typos’, the addition of two people in the acknowledgments section, and a correction to the self-report measure of OC use.

We have addressed the referees’ concerns as follows:

Comment 1: In the impact model, you could take out maternal mortality from the ‘reduced impact’ box: although this is certainly a logical and desirable consequences of increased post-abortion contraceptive use, it is not something you can or will measure in this trial, so given you mentioned potential impacts on maternal mortality in your background, perhaps you don’t need to do so here?

‘Maternal mortality’ has been removed from the ‘impact’ box as per this suggestion.

Comment 2: The 20 qualitative interviews seemed to be very geared towards ‘improving the intervention’ under the assumption that it will work, rather than for use in process evaluation, i.e. to understand what may have led to impact or lack thereof. For this you would need to speak to people who are using contraception at four months and others who do not. If this is in fact what you intend to do, it might be worth specifying it.

We have provided further information on selection of participants for interview. Participants will be selected purposively to include users and non-users of contraception. We state that additional objectives of the interviews are to identify active components of the intervention (please see highlighted changes in protocol).

Comment 3: Given that your trial is not powered on the ‘second’ primary outcome (‘objective’ contraceptive use) but that this is mainly intended to verify the reliability of the main primary outcome, it might be worth: (a) further detailing how these 50 participants will be selected (randomly from the list of 500?) and (b) what results/thresholds you would use to decide whether the self-report measure was reliable or not.
We have provided further information on selection of participants for objective measures of contraception use. We have also provided details on how we will compare self-report and objective measures by calculating sensitivity and specificity. We are unable to present a threshold to determine if the self-report measures are reliable, as no standards currently exist, but will comment on the limitations of data collection in the discussion section when publishing the trial results.

**We have addressed the following editorial requests:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Please ensure the title conforms to journal style for study protocol articles. The title should follow the format ?___________: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The title has been adjusted accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Please state clearly whether or not you have funding in the acknowledgement section. If there is no funding, please state this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The statement on funding has been moved to the acknowledgement section as per this request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Please mention each author individually in your Authors? Contributions section. We suggest the following kind of format (please use initials to refer to each author's contribution): ?AB carried out the molecular genetic studies, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. JY carried out the immunoassays. MT participated in the sequence alignment. ES participated in the design of the study and performed the statistical analysis. FG conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination and helped to draft the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have mentioned the contribution of each author in the author contributions section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any further questions please don’t hesitate to contact us. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Smith

Dr Chris Smith
Marie Stopes International Cambodia, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine