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To BMC Health Services Research:

We have addressed all comments in a point-by-point response below and revisions to the manuscript as requested. Please note that all comments were minor revisions and we have made all changes requested by the reviewer. As we have made all requested revisions, we hope the journal editor can make a quick decision about publication without requiring a third round of re-review. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the journal style.

Please do reach out to us for any questions. We thank the journal editor for the time in reviewing and look forward to a speedy decision on this manuscript.

Reviewer: Marge Koblinsky

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Lines 203-211: Again I would not rely on readers knowing the SARA measure of availability of BEmOC vs CEmOC facilities and suggest spelling this out in the document. We thank the reviewer for this comment and have incorporated the suggested correction. In lines 208-212 and throughout the manuscript we have spelled out the full term “Service Availability and Readiness Assessment” rather than use the acronym “SARA” to ensure readers understand this phrase.

2. Lines 174-8 and 247-249 and Figure 3: I still do not understand how 10,380 women with ob complications and 1004 reporting near miss, add to 10,580 women with data on care seeking. Perhaps you can clarify further? We thank the reviewer for requesting this clarification. The total number of women with data on care seeking is 10,580, consisting of 1,004 women with near misses and 9,576 women with obstetric complications (the last number was incorrectly reported as 10,380 previously). We have made the corrections to these numbers and added clarifying text in lines 246-251 as well as line 266 to clarify these numbers.

3. Line 257: "...both partners wanting a pregnancy." I think you have deleted elsewhere pregnancy wantedness by husband as the woman is stating this information; if so, this statement would best also reflect just the woman's pregnancy wantedness. The reviewer is correct, we had re-categorized this variable to indicate the woman’s pregnancy wantedness only. Thus we have edited the text in lines 258-261 to indicate that this variable captures women’s pregnancy wantedness and not wantedness of both partners.

4. You mention in the conclusion that you used a detailed maternal morbidity module; it would be good to describe this in the Methods section as well. We have added details on the morbidity module to lines 146-151 of the Methods section.

5. "Data", the word used throughout the article, is typically plural, but most often you use a singular verb. We have corrected our use of the word “data” as plural throughout the manuscript (lines 110, 176-177, 189-190, 359, 407-409, 725) where we had previously used the word as singular.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Editorial Requests

Trial Registration

Please also include the TRN as the last line of the abstract: We have added the trial number of the parent trial (NCT00860470) as the last line of this abstract (Line 61) but would like to note that this study reports results from a secondary analysis of this trial and is not reporting the primary results of the parent JiVitA-3 trial.

We thank the journal editor for the time in reviewing and look forward to a speedy decision on this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Shegufta Shefa Sikder, PhD