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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to re-review this manuscript. I now have the following minor essential revisions which generally relate to more attention to detail required throughout:

1. The abstract refers to 15.9% of childbearing age but Table 1 states 16.3%
2. The abstract states that family/friends were the first choice for support but Table 2 indicates doctor
3. Suggest stating that the University of Alberta is in Canada in the first sentence of the methods section for those who may not know
4. Although nothing can be done about the minimum age of the survey, still think childbearing age should be classified to include the next age group i.e. 35-44 years
5. Although a clarification has been made about incomplete interviews towards the bottom of p9, presume there was also item non-response?
6. How was the response rate calculated?
7. Different percentages are presented at the bottom of p9 compared to those presented in Table 1 with regards to age
8. Where are the public health nurse data referred to at the top of p11 and two-thirds of the way down p14?
9. Other factors were also associated with accurate knowledge of treatment options than those stated half way down p11 as well as the treatment options stated at the top of p16?
10. Include another statement of ‘data not shown’ at the very top of p13
11. Response rate stated as being 27.6% on p9 but 27.5% on p17
12. Are the data for age skewed? If so, perhaps the median should be presented rather than the mean on p17?
13. Add Canada to the table titles
14. Although the footnote to the tables indicates that the responses by variable differs, some explanation around how the percentages are calculated are also required as many do not add to 100% so perhaps valid percentages are not calculated which needs to be clear to the reader
15. Stars seem to be missing for the adjusted odds ratios
16. The year needs to be included in the table title of Table 4
17. The table title to Table 5 needs to be much more informative including who, when and where

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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