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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a very well written paper with reasonable sample size involving multiple centers within a country.

Minor essential revisions for the following points:

1. Of 5216 participants, 23% had CT and 90% had FAS. Therefore, some women must have undergone both CT & FAS. It follows that the experience of women with CT and the result of CT (eg the numerical risk is borderline but the overall result is negative) could be an important factor affecting women's decision to undergo FAS. This was NOT addressed by the paper

2. The gestation at entry to pregnancy care was not mentioned. This is important because CT is not applicable to women seeking pregnancy care after the first trimester. These women might have completed all the questionnaires and be included in this study. It might turn out that the low CT uptake rate was due to women attending practices too late. ANY need for separate Chi square test?"

3. Line 76: add "the" between "about" and "factors".

4. Lines 84-85: to replace "have the same options...diagnostic testing" by "are followed by the same diagnostic options for positive results"

5. Line 101: change "is" to "was"

6. Line 102: change "the time" to "when"

7. Line 105: Second questionnaire was completed at around 34 weeks' gestation? According to the design of the DELIVER study detailed in Mannien's paper, the second questionnaire was completed between 35 weeks of pregnancy and delivery.

8. Lines 118-119: I don't understand the message conveyed by "the classification used by of ethnicity (Dutch, non-Dutch) of Statistics Netherlands"

9. Line 121: suggest to use "ascertained" in place of "measured".

10. Line 136: Suggest to delete the word "highest".

11. Line 142: The disposable income is measured by total personal income after tax. Mind you that despite a low personal income for the woman, the disposable
income could be high for other reasons (eg the partner, who is the sole bread-winner of the family, earns a good salary.)

12. Lines 147-150: Logistic regression analyses have been good enough. Any need for separate Chi square test?

13. Line 160: I'm not in a position to comment on multilevel analysis as I have no experience using it. I suggest review by a statistician.

14. Line 172: There were 7907 participants mentioned there. But in the DELIVER study reported by Mannien, 7685 women returned at least one questionnaire.
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