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The Editor-in-Chief
BMC Women’s Health
25th June 2018.
Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Re: Re-submission of Manuscript

Reference is made to above heading.

We hereby re-submit our manuscript titled; “Reasons for Delay in Seeking Treatment among Women with Obstetric Fistula in Tanzania: A Qualitative Study” to be considered for publication in your esteemed Journal.

We escalate your valuable observation and constructive comments which have improved the quality of our paper. The reviewers’ comments have been revised and addressed point-by-point into respective sections

This manuscript is confirmed to be original and has not been published elsewhere and is not under consideration by another journal for publication. All authors have approved and agreed on the contents for re-submission to BMC pregnancy and childbirth journal and we hereby declare no conflicting interest among authors.

Please address correspondence to: mailyimo@gmail.com
We do hope our manuscript will be given due consideration, below are the responses from reviewer comments.

Yours sincerely,

Mary Lyimo

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS JUNE, 2019
Title: Reasons for Delay in Seeking Treatment among Women with Obstetric Fistula in Tanzania: A Qualitative Study.

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS (responses addressed in the manuscript with yellow colour)

1. Editor comments:
   a. Please make sure that you are using formatting (such as indentation of paragraphs) and heading topics that are in compliance with the journal.
      Response: Thank you so much for your comments, heading, and indentation of paragraphs addressed according journal guideline
   b. Data should be included to support the findings reported on pages 7-11.
      Response: Initial the themes and sub themes were not differentiated, now this has been addressed and the data to support findings is provided Page 6-12
   c. Was this study adequately powered? If not the discussion should reflect this.
      Response: Thank you so much for your comments, this study is qualitative study which is exploratory in nature and provide a complete, detailed description of the research topic rather than power of study as in qualitative study. Ref: Creswell, J. W. (2018) Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Page 4

2. Ademola Kojeku (Reviewer 1) comments
   a. Methodology: I believe this paper can be better written. The scale of the problem described suggests that the sample size can improve.
      Response: Thank you so much for your comments, it’s very true the sample size can be improved in future, currently the study had be done and is not easy to increase the number of participants.
   b. The methodology can be strengthened by describing questions asked by the interviewer better.
      Response: Comments a have been addressed methodology part Pg. 4 line 24-26
   c. A comparative cohort could also strengthen the argument of societal practices influencing this outcome. These can come in a follow-up publication. The current form needs re-writing. All the best
      Response: Thank you so much for your advice, this will be addressed in follow up publication.

3. Joao Paulo Leonardo Pinto, MD.,MSc. (Reviewer 2):
a. As said before, this is a very important matter of public health and studies such as this should be encouraged, because only promoting awareness we can provoke development of public health policies to promote not only treatment but also to prevent obstetric fistula of happening.

Response: Thank you so much for the comments and accepting this paper, it’s very true promoting awareness could increase early seeking of fistula treatment and also prevent the occurrence obstetric fistula.

b. English must be reviewed; English language have been reviewed. Whole document

4. Amr Mahran, MD, MS (Reviewer 4)

a. I have no further comments.

Response: We real appreciate for accepting this paper and valuable constructive comments you have shared to improve this paper.

5. Ademola Kojeku (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

a. Response: Thank you for this information, well noted and the authors comments have been written in the box