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Title
Assistive technology use and human rights enjoyment: A cross-sectional study in Bangladesh

Major compulsory revisions

Attach questionnaire for principal outcomes measures.
Questions have been included in an appendix.

Timing and methodology for administering the questionnaire vis-à-vis IOI-HA in the companion study should be clarified.
This comment has not been addressed. All questions were asked at a single interview, which is indicated in the manuscript. IOI-HA was an integral part of the questionnaire, but as it is not relevant to this study it is not mentioned.

How can the results be related to the more obvious issues of discrimination and stigma in the use of assistive technology?
This comment has not been addressed. The issue of assistive technology and negative attitudes has been covered in another paper using data from the same sample and the same questionnaire. However, as this manuscript was submitted before the other paper was published, it was not included. See: Borg et al. (Early on line.) Assistive technology use is associated with reduced capability poverty: a cross-sectional study in Bangladesh. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology.

The similarities and differences among users of hearing aids and wheelchairs in relation to human rights should be clarified.
This comment has not been addressed. We believe that the similarities and differences are satisfactorily described in the text without making a direct comparison, e.g. in the Results section of the Abstract. We can understand that there might be an interest in describing them further. However, it may lead to a risk for prioritizing one type of assistive technology over the other, which is not the intention of this study.

How many were recruited by which method in the lists of people with disabilities maintained by local organizations?
A sentence has been inserted clarifying that the proportion of people being recruited by what method is unknown.

What population is intended to be represented?
As described in the manuscript, the study compares the situation between people using and not using assistive technology living in eight districts of Bangladesh. The paper already indicates that the districts were selected purposefully. The paper also discusses the limitations of the sample being representative of all people with disabilities in Bangladesh.

Selection of possible confounders.
The rationale for and limitations of the selected confounders are already discussed in the Methods and Discussion sections.
Clarify cut-off points in table 1.

Continuous variables in table 1 were not dichotomized with the exception of “Duration of use”. The latter variable was used in the analysis presented in table 5, where the cutoff point is described in both the Methods and Results sections.

Omit the word “multivariate” in “multivariate analysis by logistic regression”.

The word “multivariate” has been omitted.

**Minor essential revisions**

Insert “rural” before “Bangladesh” in title.

“Rural” has not been inserted as the respondents live in both rural and urban areas of Bangladesh.

Abstract: Results “Users of wheelchairs… significantly higher… significantly lower…” Comparison groups should be clearly stated.

A clarification has been made.

Methods: Why was thumb printing not considered as alternative to written consent?

As reported, we followed the method usually practiced in Bangladesh.

Results: The abbreviations in the tables should be defined as footnotes.

Footnotes have been added.

All abbreviations used in the manuscript should be defined under a separate heading before references.

Abbreviations have been added as suggested.

Reference 14 should be revised appropriately with access date stated.

Reference 14 has been revised as suggested. Also reference 20 has been revised in the same way.

Are internal consistency scores available?

No, these scores are not available.

Was test-retest reliability examined?

No. Due to time-constraints, test-retest reliability could not be examined.

Provide information on sample size calculation.

Information on sample size calculation has been provided.

Clarify non-users of wheelchairs.

A clarification has been made in the text. As indicated in table 3, the self-rated ambulatory capacity among non-users of wheelchairs is slightly higher than among wheelchair users, although the difference is not statistically significant. Among non-users of wheelchairs, none claims that they have an assistive device which they use. (Although 1 has a crutch, 2 have sticks and 3 have another type of device which they do not use.)

Clarify 2nd and 3rd to last sentences in the background.

The sentences have been extended, which is hoped to satisfy the comment.

Three vs. four items to measure standard of living.

Table 1 indicates that 4 items were used to measure standard of living. The text states that 3 + 1 items were used, i.e. 4 items. Thus, no revision is needed.
In addition to the revisions made above, table 5 has been replaced by an updated analysis and the text has been revised correspondingly.

Some editing of the language has been made, e.g., more commas have been inserted.