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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor, BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth

18th March 2019

Dear Andrea Dall'Asta

Thank you for sending us the reviewers’ comments on our manuscript entitled Preferences for aspects of antenatal and newborn screening: a systematic review.

We have revised the manuscript addressing the feedback received. The changes are highlighted in green text.

We look forward to hearing your views on this revised version of the manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Caroline Vass, PhD on behalf of my co-authors:

Susanne Georgsson, PhD (susanne.georgsson@shh.se)
Fiona Ulph, PhD (Fiona.ulph@manchester.ac.uk)
Katherine Payne, PhD (katherine.payne@manchester.ac.uk)
Reviewer 1: Laura Sarno

1. The paper by Vass et al, is a systematic review of studies eliciting preferences for antenatal and postnatal screening programs. They focus on two different methods for quantifying preferences and the impact of different attributes. The topic is quite difficult and I don't know if it will be of great interest for your readers. However, the paper is well written and the review is well structured, therefore I think it deserves publication.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their kind comments on our manuscript.

2. Please, find below few corrections: Line 160: delete "The"

Response: We thank the reviewer for highlighting this mistake. The manuscript has been corrected.

3. Line 186: please, correct this sentence: "found this was type of information to be the highest valued attribute".

Response: We have corrected the grammatical error highlighted by the reviewer.

Reviewer 2: Alessandra Familiari

4. The manuscript is interesting per se and well written, the methodology is clear and the discussion is in line with the results.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their kind comments on our manuscript.

5. My big concern is whether this topic is in line with the aims of the journal and my feeling is that this paper is not of sufficiently high priority for publication in BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. Although the paper may be of some interest to a limited circle of our readers, I would give priority to papers potentially affecting the clinical management of pregnancy disorders. I would therefore reject the paper. Thank you very much and best wishes

Response: The reviewer raises concerns about the manuscript’s content and its relation to the topics typically covered by BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth. We want to highlight to the editor (and reviewers) that BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth has published papers relating to both the
methods (quantitative preference studies) and topics (antenatal and newborn screening) covered by the review presented in this manuscript.

For example, the systematic review in our manuscript focuses on studies which have employed quantitative preference elicitation methods. BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth published a systematic review of quantitative preference literature (albeit relating to women’s birth place) in 2016. See Hollowell et al. Women’s birth place preferences in the United Kingdom: a systematic review and narrative synthesis of the quantitative literature.

Our systematic review focuses on studies considering antenatal and newborn screening. The research complements other explorations (both qualitative and quantitative) that have been published by BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth. For example, in 2017 the journal published Ngan et al. Obstetric professionals’ perceptions of non-invasive prenatal testing for Down syndrome: clinical usefulness compared with existing tests and ethical implications, and last year Sadlecki, et al. Why do patients decline amniocentesis? Analysis of factors influencing the decision to refuse invasive prenatal testing.

BMC Pregnancy & Childbirth was our first choice of journal and the manuscript has never been submitted elsewhere. We feel strongly that the article will be of interest to readers.