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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers of Systematic Reviews;

Thank you for forwarding the reviewer’s comments on our manuscript “Comparing Options for Women Seeking Permanent Conception in High Resource Countries: A protocol for a systematic review” (SYSR-D-17-002266_). Thank you for the opportunity to revise our paper. We are grateful for the constructive feedback of the reviewers, which has improved our protocol and will allow us to address an important gap in the literature.

We hope the response to the comments below will fully address the reviewer’s comments and suggestions regarding the grammar and formatting of the manuscript. If you have any further questions or suggestions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

The Authors
Editor: Erik Loeffen:

Editor’s Comments: You have answered the questions of the reviewers adequately.

RESPONSE:

We would like to thank all of the reviewers once again for their constructive feedback, and improving the quality of this manuscript.

Editor’s Comments: However, before we can accept your article please check for punctuation.

RESPONSE:

The authors would like to thank the Editor for this reminder. We have reviewed the manuscript to ensure proper punctuation throughout the manuscript. All changes are shown through track changes.

Editor’s Comments: Page 10, line 17 is "(ie. Hospitals, clinics, etc.)." but should read "(i.e. hospitals, clinics, etc.

RESPONSE: Thank you for highlighting this punctuation error. We have changed the sentence to read: “(i.e. hospitals, clinics, etc.).”

Editor’s Comments: Small text issues (e.g. page 10, line 45 is " reproductive age (15-49)", but should read " reproductive age (15-49 years)"

RESPONSE: Thank you for highlighting this text issue. The sentence now reads “… samples of women of reproductive age (15-49 years)”, and we have reviewed the manuscript for other potential text issues. All changes are shown in track changes.
Editor’s Comments: Citing errors (e.g. page 12, line 19, information about Mendeley (company, country, etc.) is missing).

RESPONSE: Thank you for highlighting this citing error. The information about Mendeley has been added, so the sentence now reads:

“Throughout the review process, articles will be stored in the Mendeley Reference Manager (Version 1.17.17, Mendeley Ltd., 2017).” We have also added a reference for the Mendeley software.

We have also reviewed the manuscript for further citing errors.

Editor’s Comments: Also please check journal policy for citation location. If I'm correct it should be after the dot and not before or half-sentence, but I might be wrong here.

RESPONSE: Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have reviewed the journal citation policy for BMC Systematic Reviews, and the in-text citation is inserted after the document is referenced within the text (ie. mid-sentence or at the end of the sentence) rather than at the end of the sentence, after the period. Therefore we have left the citation location as it currently is submitted.

RESPONSE:

Thank you very much for your thoughtful comments and suggestions for improving the protocol and subsequent quality of the systematic review.