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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Palacios:

Thank you for your and the reviewers’ comments on our paper titled, “Real-world experience of women using extended-cycle vs monthly-cycle combined oral contraception in the United States: the National Health and Wellness Survey,” submitted to BMC Women's Health (BMWH-D-17-00225R1). We have detailed our responses to each comment below, and we note the manuscript pages where revised text can be found.

We look forward to receiving your comments on the revision. Please do not hesitate to contact me by phone and/or email if there is any other information that you require.

Sincerely,

Rossella E. Nappi, MD, PhD
Research Center for Reproductive Medicine
Gynecological Endocrinology and Menopause
IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo Foundation
Reviewer Comments:

1. Please add a statement to the effect in your manuscript that states you had permission to use the MMAS-8 scale

Response: A statement was added to the acknowledgements indicating that permission was granted to use the MMAS-8 scale on pages 7, 18.

2. Please confirm if an ethics committee approved the procedure for electronic consent


3. Currently, the statement in your “consent for publication” section of your declarations is incorrect. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Response: Thank you for the clarification. This change has been made on page 16.

4. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: The funding statement has been amended on page 17.

5. The individual contributions of ALL authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Currently, RN, MCM and BT are missing. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship

Response: We have revised the author contribution statement on page 18.
6. Please provide a list of all the abbreviations used in the manuscript. This list should be placed just before the Declarations section. All abbreviations should still be defined in the text at first use.

Response: A list of abbreviations has been added to the manuscript on pages 15-16.

7. Please change the "methods and materials" heading to instead be "methods"

Response: This change has been made on page 6.

8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: We will be sure to upload the manuscript as a single, clean file.