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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Editorial Team

Kindly find enclosed our revised manuscript entitled ‘Poverty, urban-rural classification and term infant mortality: A population-based multilevel analysis’ (PRCH-D-18-00636), along with a point-by-point reply to each of the editor and reviewers’ comments.

We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the valuable feedback and suggestions. All of this input has substantially enriched our article and its contribution to the literature. We have revised our manuscript to address each of the editors’ suggested minor revisions and reviewers’ comments.

1. Please remove the watermark included in your manuscript.

As requested we have removed the watermark included in the manuscript and uploaded a clean version of the document.

2. Please state in the designated input box, whether the maps depicted in figure 2 are your own or taken from another source. If taken from another source please acknowledge the source in the figure legend, and if it is under copyright also state the written permission given to use and adapt it. If the above conditions are not met the image needs to be removed. Please note the editors may request proof of permission at any time.
Thank you for your suggestion. Figure 2 is indeed taken from another source. We have included a source reference in both the text (Discussion, line 234) and in the figure legend. Permission to use this figure for publication has been provided by the US Census Bureau, Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) Program on October 30th, 2018. Proof of permission is available on request.

Response to Reviewers

Bernardo Hernández Prado (Reviewer 1)

1. The authors have done a great job addressing the comments of the reviewers. I would have no further comments to this paper.

We greatly appreciate the reviewers’ thoughtful comments that have improved the quality of our manuscript.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2):

1. PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS: Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: the revision further adds to the messages of the paper, highly recommend

We thank the reviewer for their thoughtful comments that have strengthened the clarity and quality of our manuscript.