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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this very interesting paper, addressing an important topic, acceptability of antenatal screening for non RhD RBC antibodies. The study is introduced clearly in the paper, with a good rationale. However the measures used are not presented clearly and the scoring mechanism requires supporting validity information. If these concerns can be addressed I advise publishing this paper.

Major compulsory revisions

Abstract, Page 3 The balance between burden and utility is not clearly explained in the text of the paper
The lack of a response rate is a serious limitation and the potential impact of this must be included in the discussion
There is a lack of clarity about the questions and tools used. It may be appropriate to include the questionnaires in an appendix to overcome this problem
Page 11 Information of the validity of the scoring system used is required.
Tables 2 and 4 should be included in the main body of the text, not as supplementary files
Page 13, paragraph 3. "The great majority .. had a fairly accurate interpretation " may not be appropriate if 20% did not understand their result
Page 14, a causal link is suggested which may not be supported by the data
Page 15, Paragraph 2. Please provide clarity on " bad impact"
Page 15, Table 6. Data other than p values is required in this table.
Page 15, paragraph 3 Supporting data for the text is required
Page 16 paragraph 2 Data is required int the text to support the statement on attiudes towards RBC antibody screening
Page 17 Background characterisitcs may not have emerged in the multivariate analysis because the sample was not representative of the population as a whole.

Minor essential revisions

The text refers to Fugure 1 on page 8 and on page 9. Are these references to the same figure?
Page 10, how long after testing were questionnaires completed?

Page 14, last paragraph. "The Stai was lower" - please give the comparison group

Discretionary revision

It would be helpful to include information in the introduction on the screening policy in other countries

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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