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To

The Managing Editor-in-Chief

BMC Public Health

Subject: Submission of revised manuscript in BMC Public Health

Dear Sir,

Attached herewith, please find the revised version of our paper whose manuscript number is PUBH-D-15-00454, for possible publications in your reputed journal BMC Public Health. I have gone through comments of both the reviewers and immensely thankful for their valuable suggestions. Most of the suggested revisions have been performed. Almost all the revisions in the text have been highlighted by italicizing the changes made. Still, there are few modifications which may not be highlighted separately, but have been mentioned below point wise for each of the reviewer.

Apart from the revisions suggested by reviewers two more corrections have been made in the paper. The state named “Orissa” was in east zone while performing the logistic regression analysis, but in table depicting the classification of states and descriptive table, it was put in central zone. This has been corrected. The second correction is that among twenty nine regions concerned for data collection in NFHS-3 few regions for example Delhi is a union territory, not state. So in the revised version of manuscript the word state has been supplemented with union territory and it appears as states/union territories.
Given below are the point wise responses to both reviewers:

Reviewer 1:
1. As per the suggestion made, the title of the submitted manuscript has been revised and new title is “Contraceptive Use before First Pregnancy by Women in India (2005-2006): Determinants and Differentials”.

For method section:
2. SPSS 19 has been used to perform the statistical analysis part and this fact has been added to the methods section at page 4 of 13.

3. The study utilizes data from National Family Health Survey, which is Indian analogous to DHS and this data is freely available at DHS website for secondary utilization. The ethical consents from the respondents have been taken at the time of survey. In general, there is no requirement to mention the ethical clearance aspect in the studies based on DHS data; therefore, authors have not mentioned it as well.

4. A map of India depicting the grouping of states/union territories has been provided.

Reviewer 2:
1. As per the suggestion made the title of the manuscript has been revised to”Contraceptive Use before First Pregnancy by Women in India (2005-2006): Determinants and Differentials”.

2. The word “explore” has been replaced by appropriate words at all the places suggested by reviewers. Same holds for “to limit their first birth”, limit word has been replaced by prorogue or postpone.

3. The term ever married women has been modified to “women who have ever been married” or similar substitutions.

4. The reference for NFHS-3 report has been provided in the line 45, on page 1 of 13 (after the revisions total number of pages in manuscript is 13). But, I would like to supplement that the reference of this NFHS report was already provided in line 51, on page 1of 12, in previously submitted manuscript.
5. NFHS-2 also has been mentioned as data source in method section, but making comparison among NFHS-2 and NFHS-3 with respect to study variable was only a very small part of study, authors did not go in detail discussion about NFHS-2. Further, the word trend in line 51 on page 2 of 12 refers to trends across different stratum of each explanatory variable.

6. The word “young” has been omitted from line 52 on page 2 of 12.

7. As pointed out, the repeated lines have been excluded.

8. The acronyms used in line 48, on page 3 of 12, have been described in last line of page 4 of 12. But in the revised paper, the authors have abbreviated these acronyms in the abbreviation section.

9. The question numbers have been removed from line 56 on page 3 of 12.

10. Ampersand has been replaced by “and” in whole paper.

11. The interpretation of odds ratio everywhere in the paper is correct. Since the odds for reference category are 1.00, if odds ratio for any category is 1.33, the percentage increase in her likelihood to have Y j=1 increase by 33%. As per consultation with a statistician is concerned, both the authors themselves are statistician. Dr. K.K. Singh being Professor in Department of Statistics, Faculty of Science, Banaras Hindu University, India and Anjali Pandey is research scholar there only. Also in many of our reference papers for example Aragaw, 2015 and Singh et al., 2013 similar explanations for odds ratio have been given.

12. The legends of the figures were correct but as pointed out the calculations were wrong, which have been corrected in the reviewed paper. In addition, the differences between two percentages, wherever calculated, have been written as “percentage points”.

13. The lines 48 and 49, on page 9 of 12, have been modified to make clear that problem is with implementation of enforcement of laws related to legal minimum age at marriage.
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