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Reviewer's report:

There are a few minor essential revisions.

Abstract:
1) The results should include the total number of calls made.

2) The 2nd sentence of the Results needs to be reworded to clarify what the different percentages (74% versus 53% and 88% versus 45% for fixed line and mobiles, respectively) represent. It is unclear as currently written since it seems to infer all people were contacted, but this is not true of most of the non-respondents.

Methods:
3) It is stated that “sampling was stratified by state of residence to recruit women in similar proportions to the geographic distribution of young women in Australia”, but (as noted by the authors in the Discussion), it is not possible to identify the state for mobile numbers, so how was this achieved for the Mobile phone group?

Results:
4) Were the response rates between the two groups statistically different? P values should be added to Table 1.

5) Why was Language difficulty included in the Unknown eligibility? English language competence was noted as an eligibility criterion, meaning that this group should be in the Ineligible group. (The numbers here are small and won’t affect overall results, but nevertheless seemingly this group has been misclassified).

6) Also, the last paragraph of the Results says” Of women contacted by fixed-line, almost all reported having a mobile phone (97%, 135/139) while for those contacted by mobile phone, 39% (50/127) reported not having a “landline” at home.” These denominators don’t exactly match with the 140 and 128 (Table 1) who completed the interviews.

Discretionary Revisions

In terms of this report, the fact that those with mobiles only were more likely to identify as Indigenous and were less likely to live at home with their parents is not crucial, but it would be interesting to know how the authors intend on overcoming
this for their main study given that there may well be associations between these two factors and sexual/reproductive health.

Note: On the top of page 4, the authors refer to an Appendix, but I have not been able to access or review this.
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