Author’s response to reviews

Title: Psychological health of women who have conceived using Assisted Reproductive Technology in Taiwan: Findings from a longitudinal study

Authors:

Mei-Zen Huang (meizen.huang@gmail.com)
Chien-Huei Kao (chenhuei@ntunhs.edu.tw)
Kuan-Chia Lin (kuanchia@ym.edu.tw)
Jiann-Loung Hwang (2401clinic@gmail.com)
Shuby Puthussery (shuby.puthussery@beds.ac.uk)
Meei-Ling Gau (meeiling@ntunhs.edu.tw)

Version: 1 Date: 08 May 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Detailed Response to Reviewer

Ref. No.: BMWH-D-18-00110

Title: Psychological health of women conceived using Assisted Reproductive Technology in Taiwan: Findings from a longitudinal study

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your kindness and your noteworthy comments and suggestions. They were very helpful for us when revising the paper. We appreciate the efforts you expended on this paper. We have carefully revised the manuscript according to your comments and suggestions. The following is the revision done by us in response.

Statistical Review
Revised manuscript

Page (P)/Para (p)/ Line(l)

Revise the title of the manuscript, which is misleading. It should refer to "Psychological health of women who have conceived using Assisted Reproductive Technology". This error is repeated in several places in the Abstract and main text (e.g. reference to "naturally conceived controls" [p. 5 line 46] should be to "controls who had conceived naturally") - although elsewhere in the text this error is not made.

Overall, the language used in the manuscript is appropriate and use of English is adequate. However the manuscript requires careful proof-reading to excise relatively minor errors, see for example page 8 lines 17-20: where it is stated that "The inclusion criteria for participation were that the woman have not had any live births". This should surely refer to previous live births? In addition the text includes frequent confusion between use of singular and plural in the same sentence.

It is not evident that the State Anxiety Inventory, the Maternity Social Support Scale, the Intimate Bond Measure or the Parenting Stress Index have been validated for use among non-Western subjects. This merits further clarification/discussion.

The authors should include a section that

Information on study

The psychometrics of our study’s instrument are now reported in the Discussion section and the merits are discussed.

Author’s response

The mistakes were corrected.

P1, title, line 1
P3, title, line 1
P3, background, line 5
P4, conclusion, line 5
P5, title, line 1
P6, para1, line 2
P8, para3, line 3
P22, para1, line12

Thanks for drawing our attention to this.
The language used in the manuscript was reviewed again by an English professional.
P9, participants, line 3; and all language used in the manuscript was reviewed again by an English professional

P27, conclusion, para 1, line 1-18
discusses the limitations of the study. Limitations have been added in the Discussion section.