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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses of the revision

RE: PRCH-D-15-00180R1 Screening high-risk clusters for developing birth defects in mothers in Shanxi Province, China: application of latent class cluster analysis.

Dear Editor Begley,

We are really grateful to yours and the reviewers’ helpful comments and thoughtful suggestions which substantially improve our manuscript. We revised our paper according to the comments. All changes made to the text are marked in the track changes mode and in red font in the paper. We hope the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in the journal. Below you will find our point-to-point responses to Reviewer reports:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
(1) Line 309 “Meanwhile, 39.60% of pregnant women reported took folic acid in our study” should be “Meanwhile, 39.60% of pregnant women in our study reported that they took folic acid”

Response: Thanks for your comments. We have accepted your suggestions and modified them in the Manuscript.

(2) Line 313 “large need to increase this portion” should be “large need to increase this proportion”

Response: Changed. Thanks!

(3) Line 333 “On the other hand, the education level of most mothers in the study were junior high school graduates” should be “As most mothers in the study were junior high school graduates”

Response: Thanks for your comments. We have accepted your suggestions and modified them in the Manuscript.

(4) Line 352 “Meanwhile, as the heavy coal mining area in China, the pollution characteristics need to be deep reflected in the designed questionnaires.” I think you probably meant “Also, as the study was conducted in a heavy coal mining area in China, the pollution characteristics need to be taken account of in the designed questionnaires.”

Response: Changed. Thank you for your suggestion.
(5) Line 359 “On the other hand, we did not make a difference between…” should be “We also did not differentiate between…”

Response: We have modified this sentence as suggested.

(6) Line 361 “Further research should focus on more rational questionnaires design, and should also work to identify genes…” I think you have explained about the questionnaire enough, so this could probably be “Further research should work to identify genes…”

Response: We are grateful for your valuable comments. We have accepted your suggestions and modified them in the Manuscript.