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Dear Doctor,

MS: 1892833721130857 - Understanding sexual and reproductive health needs of adolescents: evidence from a formative evaluation in Wakiso district, Uganda

I am profoundly very happy that you quickly reviewed our revised manuscript and sent comments. Unfortunately we did not receive them but your kind staff made a close follow-up and we got them.

Our team has now had an opportunity to review the comments and please find below a point-by-point response to the issues raised.

Yours faithfully,

Dr. Lynn Atuyambe, MPH, Ph.D. –Karolinska Institute/Makerere University

Assoc. Professor, lead and corresponding author
Response to comments raised by the Editor in Chief

Comment 1: In the email that we sent you we asked for a better structure of the Discussion section. However, in the new version you did not follow such structure. There is no any mention about the limitations of your study.

Response: Thank you for this observation. In this version, we have indeed revised the discussion starting with the principal findings in the first paragraph. We have also added relevant studies and reviews/meta-analysis. For example one by Berhan, Y. and A. Berhan, A meta-analysis of risky sexual behaviour among male youth in developing countries. AIDS research and treatment, 2015. In relation to this study and at the end, we have stated the research questions for the future. We state that “While this was a formative study, bigger study with national coverage would be good to undertake in the near future”

Furthermore, we have restructures the discussion into 4 main component of investigation i.e. main problems adolescents face, adolescent RH needs, their health seeking behaviour and preferred services.

Our revised manuscript indicates strengths and limitations of this study.

“One of the strength of this study was the categorisation of the different groups that helped us to make compulsions across these multiple categories. However, the limitation of this study was the definition of what constitutes SRH services, it is different in different contexts hence it makes it difficult to generalise the findings. This study was also limited in scope and coverage”

Comment 2: Also, you are making many recommendations that are not the result of your study. You just measured the situation of adolescents but your study did not measure the impact of the interventions that you are proposing. We are suggesting you to avoid recommendations that are beyond the results of your study.

Response: Thank you, we have taken a keen look and revised our recommendation in light of what we found for the study.

Comment 3: Regarding references there are many not coming from journals. In these cases please put the link where these texts can be accessed jointly with date that you later access such references.

Response: We thank you for this comment. As much as possible, we tried to make this formative article as relevant to our local situation as possible. We, therefore, obtained several reference materials locally from government sectors some of which were in hard copy. However, where web based materials were available we have indicated source and when accessed within endnote software. All references now are locatable.