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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for taking the time to review our paper revision. Our responses to the reviewer comments are detailed below.

Reviewer #2:
My comments/suggestions were well addressed. I have few minor suggestions:

Reviewer #2 Comment 1:
Line 25: I suggest "Access to family planning services is fundamental to improve population health."
Reviewer #2 Comment 1 Response: Thank you. Line 25 now reads: “Access to family planning services is fundamental to improve population health.”

Reviewer #2 Comment 2:
Lines 46-47: I suggest "Existing tools may not have been adopted because of lack of evidence showing their efficacy and effectiveness in the clinical setting".
Reviewer #2 Comment 2 Response: Thank you. Lines 46-47 now read: “Existing tools may not have been adopted because of lack of evidence showing their efficacy and effectiveness in the clinical setting.”

Reviewer #2 Comment 3:
Line 72: you need to define the acronym MEC.
Reviewer #2 Comment 3 Response: Thank you. We have spelled this out (now line 118), and it now reads: “The algorithm for this tool is based on the United States Medical Eligibility Criteria for Contraceptive Use guidelines [14],”
Reviewer #2 Comment 4:  
Line 82: I suggest "This tool can/may be used…". 
Reviewer #2 Comment 4 Response: This is now line 128, which reads: “This tool can be used in conjunction with BCS+ to help turn the BCS+ strategy into a visual aid.”

Reviewer #2 Comment 5: 
Lines 310-312: I suggest "This tool was developed to facilitate reproductive life planning by giving the patient a better understanding of their reproductive goals and trajectory." 
Reviewer #2 Comment 5 Response: This now reads: “This tool was developed to facilitate reproductive life planning by giving the patient a better understanding of their reproductive goals and trajectory.”

Reviewer #2 Comment 6: 
Lines 316-317: I suggest ' it has the potential to be modified for couples' and men's use..." 
Reviewer #2 Comment 6 Response: Thank you, we have incorporated this change. This sentence now reads: “While this tool was designed specifically for women, it has the potential to be modified for couples’ and men’s use.”

Reviewer #3: 
Reviewer #3 Comment 1: 
Overall, your revisions improve clarity. However, the primary outcome and description of the research design of the study is still lacking. For example, the entire methods section until the fifth paragraph is comprised of a description of the tool. I recommend moving the STUDY design to the beginning of the methods section. For example, "We conducted a descriptive study to evaluate…” "Our primary objective was to assess the proportion of subjects completing the tool who evaluated the tool as helpful…” 

Reviewer #3 Comment 1 Response: Thank you. We added a clear objective at line 63. This reads: “We were specifically interested in measuring the proportion of women who completed the tool and rated it as a helpful tool that they would use to track their reproductive goals.” Additionally, we have edited the methods section to reflect your comment. We have included two new subheadings – the first being “Study Design and Evaluation” beginning at line 70 and “Description of the FPQ/RepLI Tool” beginning at line 113. We have moved the text that describes the study design and evaluation methods to the start of the methods section as suggested (we did not track this change in the revised document; we did however track the changes where we added the subheadings). The description of the tool follows in the next subsequent subsection.

Reviewer #3 Comment 2: 
The FPQ data in the abstract is not reported in either text or table form in the main body of the manuscript. Simply proportion <1 or >1 is not sufficient. Consider addition of median (range). Consider including a demographics table 1 with two columns - those with FPQ >=1 and <1 with demographic data (parity, age, partner status) - whatever data you have from the tool itself. If you don't have data from the tool, then please only include data from the evaluation survey. 

Reviewer #3 Comment 2 Response: Thank you. We have removed the details about the FPQ from the results of the abstract and the body of the text (formerly lines 172 to 176). This also includes the removal of the original Figure 3, which summarized the FPQ information visually. We do not have data from the completed tool for all 790 women who evaluated the tool by participating in the survey, so we are unable to make an additional table as suggested. We feel that the contextual demographic data...
summarized in lines 169 to 173 are needed to provide context regarding the population our clinic serves, and we have left that aggregate data in the text.