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Author’s response to reviews:

To: Reproductive Health Editorial Board

Thank you for the opportunity to make final revisions to our accepted original research manuscript titled, “Measuring adolescent friendly health services in India: A scoping review of evaluations” for publication in Reproductive Health. We appreciate the thoughtful and constructive feedback from the reviewers. A revised manuscript is attached, both clean and with tracked changes. Specifically, we addressed the following reviewer comments:

1. Authors have divided the section "What were the main findings of the evaluations/studies?" into "process, outputs, health behaviour, health outcomes and impact". I am not able to distinguish between 'Health behaviour' and 'health outcomes'. Are these not all outcomes? The sentence "The most common health outcomes evaluated were self-reported health behaviours" (line 290) further adds to this confusion. I would suggest that the authors consider regrouping 'Health behaviour' and 'health outcomes' as simply "Outcomes" or explain the logic model better in the data analysis section (lines 173-176).

Response: In order to avoid confusion between two distinct concepts, we have chosen not to merge health behavior outcomes and programmatic health outcomes (which we have re-named programme results/impacts) into one category. We have clarified the distinction between knowledge and health behavior outcomes and programme results/impacts in the methods section and maintained that distinction in the results section.
2. Please divide the section "For what purpose have these evaluations/studies been conducted?" into process, outputs and outcomes as above and move the section just before "What were the main findings of the evaluations/studies?"

Response: We intentionally placed purpose of evaluations earlier in the results in order to highlight why the evaluations were carried out before describing design/methods, scope, and main findings of the evaluations. We wish to keep this section in its current location to logically flow from objective of evaluations to specific approach and findings. As above, we have more succinctly clarified the evaluation findings categories and noted them in more detail in this paragraph to distinguish between process, outputs, outcomes, and results/impact.


We have reviewed the manuscript thoroughly and corrected any noted errors.

All authors have participated in concept and design, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting or revising the manuscript, and have approved the revised manuscript as submitted. All authors are responsible for the reported research. No authors have conflicts of interest to disclose. This manuscript has not been submitted for publication in any other journal. It has not been published elsewhere and, should it be published in Reproductive Health, will not be published elsewhere – either in similar form or verbatim – without permission of the editors.

Thank you for your continued consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me at the information below should you have any questions or concerns.

Best regards,

Andrea J. Hoopes, MD, MPH
University of Colorado School of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics
Adult and Child Consortium for Health Outcomes Research and Delivery Science (ACCORDS)

13199 E Montview Blvd, Suite 300
Aurora, CO 80045

Email: andrea.hoopes@childrenscolorado.org

Phone 720-777-5397

Fax: 720-777-7339