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Author’s response to reviews:

We have added Point by point comments as supplementary material in a table form. Please kindly open the document. Thank you.

Response to Comments

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thank you very much for your resourceful and constructive feedback. We have revised the manuscript and we do realize that it has plenty of room for improvements. We are eager to revise further if required. In addition, should it be needed after the last revision, we would also gladly use the English proofreading manuscript service.

The following table addresses the comments from the editor and each reviewer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jose M. Belizan, MD, PhD (Editor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to avoid statements like: “To our knowledge, this is the first study”. To make such assumption we are requesting to provide a systematic review of the literature where you based your assumption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not agree to make an analysis and put the “p” value in the comparisons between the two sites. My suggestion is just to put the values without any statistical comparison.

In the tables when there only two options like “yes” of “no”; or “male” and “female” please put only one of these options since they are complementary.

In the abstract, methodology, please mention how the women were selected.

In the discussion section please describe the limitations of your study. One important limitation is the representativeness of the respondents.

In my view you make many recommendations that are beyond the results of the study. I am suggesting to tempered of avoid such recommendations. Please place the tables at the end of the text in separate pages.

Kobra Salehi, PhD Candidate (Reviewer 1)

In the abstract line 31: The sentence seems to be incorrect: Despite the high prevalence, there is yet fertility Awareness education.

In the table 2: Is this item categorized in the identified risk factors? The black magic?

Regarding to the differences in demography between the two groups, could we compare findings between groups? How we can assure that these results are resulted from such differences? please note this and discuss about it.

We have omitted the p-value and changed the wordings of “statistically significant”. “Statistical analysis” in the methods section has been changed to Data Management”.

We have updated the abstracts as such.

A very good point that we have missed. We have extended the discussion to address this issue.

Yes, we have omitted such recommendations.

Done.

We have rephrased the sentence.

Thank you for pointing that the manuscript was ambiguous. We have updated the result section so that it is clearer that black magic is considered as common myths.

A very perceptive point. Unfortunately, due to the cross-sectional nature of our survey, and without pre-existing studies, we could not perform comparison between the two groups. Tables showing differences in demography and responses regarding knowledge and attitude towards infertility is shown. However, researchers could not claim the differences were due to demographic
Please cite the ethical code.

We have cited the ethical code in the methods section.

Please explain about reliability and validity of the questionnaire and the number of its items. Introduce about each domain.

Jacquelyn Rose Hoffman, BA (Reviewer 2)

Thank you for allowing me to review your work. Broadly speaking, this work is quite ambitious in its attempt to address demographics of rural/urban populations, knowledge and attitudes. It may be best to parse out into several papers to avoid overwhelming the reader. For example, one paper could strictly compare demographics between groups.

We have decided to omit statistical analysis for this research.

The aim to 'compare and contrast' these populations could also include higher level statistical testing (e.g. ANOVA) to come to more robust conclusions.

Unfortunately, at the start of the study, we were unaware about the existence of such tool.

Furthermore, as knowledge was assessed, I would question the research team's decision to not use a validated, quantitative tool which exists currently.

Thank you for your suggestion. We adopted the questions from previously published literature that did not include such factors. Thus, we address this critical point in our discussion.

Overall, this is critical work and I applaud you for your approach to compare patients from urban vs rural settings. I notice that the demographics do not include variables for income level or other medical comorbidities that may be critical for comparison.

Thank you for your sharp review. As previously discussed, we chose not to compare the demography directly due to limitations of our cross-sectional study design and sampling method.

Furthermore, I recognize your work to attempt to identify patients' attitudes toward infertility. I do however believe that your team could provide further references of work previously executed in

Once again, thank you for your inputs. We have updated the discussion to include previous studies by the suggested authors.
this field that serve as foundational studies (e.g. Nachitgall or Becker's work). Several critical studies regarding infertility in socio-culturally diverse settings were not cited.

Should there is anything else we can do to improve the manuscripts, please do not hesitate to inform us.