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1. Reviewer: As requested in the previous review, authors are requested to include the reviewers’ and editor’s comments and provide a response directly below the comments so that the authors’ responses can be reviewed in relation to the specific comments. Please respond accordingly.

Authors: We included the reviewer's and editor's comment and we made point by point response.

2. Reviewer: On page 4 line 59, the authors state that no one refused to participate of the 420 women approached. Please confirm that there is a 100% participation rate and that participants were adequately informed about consent to participate and that they were given the option of refusing to participate during the informed consent process.

Authors: As recommended we stated that there is a 100% participation rate and that participants were adequately informed about consent to participate and that they were given the option of refusing to participate during the informed consent process, please see page 4, line 59.
3. Reviewer: On page 5, lines 38-45, the addition that the authors included describing the questionnaire is not clear. The sentence needs to be edited to be comprehensible.

Authors: We edited the sentence as recommended.

4. Reviewer: In methods section, page 6, lines 33-35, authors state that “Female genital mutilation was the dependent variable and the sexual and obstetric complications were independent variables.” The complications should be the dependent variables. Please correct.

Authors: We corrected the description of the variables as recommended by the reviewer.

5. Reviewer: There were no significant differences between the FGM/C group and non FGM/C group on socio-demographic characteristics. (pages 6-7, lines 56 – 3). Authors should state this.

Authors: We stated that there was no difference between the FGM/C group and non FGM/C group on socio-demographic characteristics, please see (pages 6-7, lines 56 – 3).

6. Reviewer: Are there differences between women with FGM/C and without FGM/C in plans to subject daughters to FGM/C? State on page 7, lines 8-15.

Authors: There was no difference between women with FGM/C and without FGM/C in plans to subject daughters to FGM/C and this was inserted on page 7, under subheading FGM types and attitude.

7. Reviewer: On page 7 in the presentation of results on sexual function, state whether the differences were statistically significant or not and include p value.

Authors: We stated the statistical differences including the P value of results on sexual function on page 7.

8. Reviewer: On page 7 line 44, unclear what is meant by “needed episiotomy wound”. Is this that they required an episiotomy?

Authors: Yes, we meant required an episiotomy and this was corrected.

9. Reviewer: On page 8, lines 1-2 which describes lack of significant results from logistic regression, this should be incorporated into the results of those sections rather than as a separate subsection. Also, the variables controlled for in the logistic regression analysis should be described in the text and in table 3.
Authors: We incorporated the findings described the lack of significant results from logistic regression into the results of the identified sexual complications rather than as a separate subsection. Also, we mentioned the variables controlled for in the logistic regression analysis please see the methods and table 3.

10. Reviewer: On page 8, line 31, authors should not use the word “proved” but rather should state that the authors of the study “found” or something similar. One study does not prove the association.

Authors: We changed the word "proved" to "found" as recommended by the reviewer.

Reviewer: Authors should acknowledge that their results are limited by using a questionnaire instrument that has not been validated. Also they should acknowledge that they did not conduct separate analyses by type of FGM/C but rather just with FGM/C or without FGM/C.

Authors: We acknowledged that our results are limited by using a questionnaire instrument that has not been validated. Also we acknowledged that we did not conduct separate analyses by type of FGM/C but rather just with FGM/C or without FGM/C, please see the limitation.

11. Reviewer: For Table 2, dyspareunia, there is a typo for women not subjected to FGM/C, it should be “24.2%”.

Authors: We corrected the typo error.

12. Reviewer: For Table 3, list covariates included in the models.

Authors: We listed the covariates included in the models.

All these changes have been highlighted to be traced easily.

This work may still need some editorial touches; these are welcomed and will be highly appreciated.

Best Regards

For authors: Prof. Ali