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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and referees of Reproductive Health,

Thank you for your second round of comments and insights on our submission. Following consideration of the comments received, we would like to submit this revised manuscript for further consideration.

Kindly find our point-to-point response to each of the reviewer’s comments below.

We hope with these adjustments and answers to the manuscript will be enough and ready for publication.
On behalf of the co-authors,

Eartha Weber, Kwame Adu-Bonsaffoh, George S Downward and Joyce Browne

#Editorial comments:
Comments from Reviewer 1:
Well done responding to all the concerns. Paper reads better.
Line 90 under introduction, do you mean geographical settings around the world or Ghana particularly?

The paper seems to focus on adverse effects in a broader sense but in some parts of the paper, you seem to mention that the focus is hypertension. If the original aim of the study was hypertension but, in the analysis, you also looked at other adverse effects you might want to make that clear in the paper.

Response:
Thank you! We are glad that the paper reads better. There is variability all over the world due to different cooking practices and amount of time spent indoors cooking. There are also differences in regions in terms of outdoor air pollution exposure within Ghana so it can be a bit tricky to compare different regions without accounting for ambient air pollution. To address this concern, I added in the distinction:

“There is variability in terms of particle composition, personal cooking behaviors within countries (including within regions of Accra, Ghana) and in between countries18,19. The variability highlights the need to analyze data at regional levels in order to more appropriately address the needs of the target populations for future interventions20,19”

For the second comment, we were trying to emphasize that the analysis was secondary, so the cohort was not set up to explore household air pollution, but it was set up to examine hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. We added a sentence fragment in order to make it clearer that we re-used previously collected data.

“ The original purpose of this cohort was to assess the incidence and risk factors of hypertensive disorders of pregnancy however, we re-used the data to crudely assess household air pollution exposure on various additional pregnancy outcomes in an exploratory manner.”