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Author’s response to reviews:


General
We made several changes in the manuscript and highlight the changes in red colour for simplicity. Majority of the comments are linked to the earlier Methods presented and with the detail clarification we have added to the method now, it has answered several questions raised and make the manuscript more clearer for understanding. However, other specific adjustment/corrections made are indicated below:

Grammar

➢ Thorough editing was done to our satisfaction. All confusing terms have been simplified or removed where necessary

➢ Claims that cannot be scientifically justified have all be removed

Introduction

Action taken:
Para 1 was re-worked and is now re-presented

We have removed justification at the end of each paragraph. This makes it possible for easy flow of understanding to the end.

Conceptual descriptions of male reproductive health challenge is now added

Examples of the prevalence rates of men sexual health problems were cited

Former P6, Para 2

Action taken:

The issues of misdeameanors, negligence, and so on has been properly linked to the sexual health problems

Methods and materials

Major adjustments were made in this section in line with Reviewers’ suggestions.

The section is now divided into segments: Selection of research location, recruitment of participants, data collection and how the data were analysed

We found the Book and the Journal recommended very useful especially in reporting the findings and we acknowledged the authors.

Majority of the comments are linked to the earlier methods presented and with this re-presentation, it has answered several questions raised and more clearer for understanding.

Results and discussion

This section has been separated into (1) Results and (2) Discussion. This provides more clarity helped us to avoid us missing the participants’ responses with authors’ intuitions or analysis.

We also benchmarked key findings with existing literature where applicable.

References

Few references were added as a result of correction made in the text.

We also used ZOTERO also to manage the references.
Limitation of the study

- We have added some limitations and suggestion for further study into the manuscript.

Conclusion and Recommendation

- We have tried to ensure that the conclusion is drawn/tied to the findings and the new recommendations would be interesting to readers and policy makers.

Rebuttal

1. The use of Table

- We synchronized the two Reviewers’ together and agreed with the first reviewer that percentages should not be used. Why: group discussion and not individual interviews and the number is very small. Thus, we would not want to use tables. Also, the quantitative aspect of the work has been published in other journals and we would not want to repeat our tables.

2. Suggestion to use ‘Women’ instead of ‘Wives’

- There is a suggestion that we use women instead of wives.

- Action taken:

- We would want the use of ‘wives’ to subsist because the participants are all wives, currently married.

- Using women might be too general. Our samples do not include the separated, divorce or singles which are part of the general term – women.

Finally, we cannot but appreciate the Reviewers for painstakingly reviewing our first presentation. We believe they will not be disappointed to read this final presentation.