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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a nice job revising the manuscript and providing additional data. The subgroup analyses showed that the differences between Dutch and non-Dutch women could merely be subscribed to the high uptake among western non-Dutch women. This is an important finding, that would have been missed without subgroup analyses. I have a few suggestions/questions for minor revision:

1. Discussion: The authors mention in the discussion that purposive sampling could have affected the results. Please shortly explain in what way.

2. Discussion: Does age play a role in the finding that women with low Dutch language proficiency (almost all first generation) have a higher uptake? Do they more often participate because they are older?

3. Discussion: Another reason for the difference between the study of Fransen et al and this study could be a difference in the period of time in which CT is more accepted and is part of standard care now?

4. Discussion. I agree with the authors that the high uptake of non-western women with low Dutch language proficiency could be an indication of uninformed participation. I think this is an important implication for further research. Why do these women participate more often than women without language barriers? Is there participation based on an uninformed choice?

I have on discretionary comment:

1. I think the paper is very lengthy and I think the authors could be a bit more concise in some parts.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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