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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewers

We thank the editor for her careful review and recommendations for further improvement of the manuscript. We have addressed all of the comments as detailed below and have highlighted the changes in the revised manuscript in red text.

Editor Comments:
A few minor remaining edits to improve readability/organization:

1. Authors state in methods, "The second session closed with women sharing their views about participation in this process and their reflections on what having answers to their priority questions might mean to the future healthcare and health outcomes of their communities.” It is
noted in discussion that participants found process 'healing' but ideally this should be included in results.

The text has been moved from Discussion to Results (xx) and the Discussion text revised accordingly.

2. Still some disconnect in how authors explain/respresent relationships between priority research questions, topics, and themes. I think what might help here is flipping and/or combining Table 1 and Table 2 to include all 4 themes, how each of the 22 topics were organized under each theme, and then examples of questions for each theme. You could then include separate columns for each of the regions and sample overall where you can include ranking of each topic for the particular area. The way it is currently presented is confusing for reader.

We have revised Table 1 to include the overarching themes, combined top priority topic list across regions, and a sample question (top ranked) from the priority questions by group. The remaining information was converted to appendices. It is important for readers to have access to the more detailed information by group and regions in the appendices, since the question and topic priorities are context dependent. We refer readers to our webpages for a full listing of the questions by topic and region.

3. In results, "maternal health before, during, after pregnancy" section is quite long, and it's somewhat difficult to follow logic of why some things are included here (e.g., page 19, line 22--stress and prematurity--why not in those respective sections?). Recommend cutting all non-essential text here and potentially grouping content under subheadings.

Additional subheadings have been added, some text shortened and the question about stress moved to the ‘stress theme’.

4. Page 11--in the introduction of the 4 themes paragraph--the prematurity theme is named differently here than in its header below. Please revise for consistency.

This has been corrected.

5. Authors state on pg 18 "Moreover, many of the topics and questions of great interest to the participants in this project do not receive the same level of investment as those topics of interest to researchers and institutions." Can you provide an example?

Examples have been added.

6. Figure 1--unable to distinguish between "Hispanic" and "Mixed". Suggest using patterns rather than variations on grey coloring to represent each race/ethnic group. Also for the San Francisco group, cannot read the numbers for Hispanic and Mixed since proportions are such small slivers (consider placing # off to side?)

We have converted Figure 1 to Table 1 for easier viewing.