After careful review of the manuscript I have made the following comments:

Abstract:
1. The last line of the ‘Methods’ section of the abstract should be written as, ‘Multivariable linear regression was used to estimate the relationship between arsenic skin lesion and age of natural menopause in women’.
2. The first sentence of the ‘Conclusion’ section should be written as, ‘This study suggests a relationship between chronic arsenic exposure (as indicated by presence of arsenic skin lesion) and age of natural menopause.

Background:
3. The second sentence should be written as, ‘Bangladesh retained WHO’s previous Guideline value for arsenic concentration in drinking water as a national standard which suggests 50µg/L or lesser amount as safe [2], although the current WHO guideline value suggests it as 10 µg/L or less [3].
4. On the page 3, paragraph 2, line 4, along with the references 11,12,13, the following reference should be added: Milton AH, Rahman B, Hasan Z, Kulsum U, Dear K, Rakibuddin M, Ali A. Chronic arsenic exposure and adverse pregnancy outcomes in Bangladesh. Epidemiology. 16 (1) 2005, pp 82-86.
5. On the page 4, line 1, the sentence should be written as, ‘In relation to this, another study suggested that arsenic causes delay in onset of menarche [16].
6. On the page 4, paragraph 2, Line 3-9, it should be written as, ‘Considering both human and animal studies, this study hypothesized that chronic arsenic exposure characterized by presence of arsenic skin lesion could have a relationship with the natural menopausal age. This may mean that arsenic associated with early or delayed menopause - in either way, this could be an undesirable outcome. If menopause occurs early, there will be a reduction in reproductive period, that means women would likely to experience of cardiovascular diseases, neurological diseases, osteoporosis and psychiatric diseases earlier in their lives [17]. On the other hand, delayed menopause referred to higher risk of breast and ovarian cancers due to their prolonged exposure to oestrogen [18].
Methods (or METHODS?):

Study area and population:

7. On the page 4, paragraph 3, 2nd sentence of this section should write as, ‘Participants with arsenic skin lesion were selected from Laksam upzilla as this area is highly contaminated to arsenic [19].

8. On the page 4, paragraph 4, the first sentence should write as; ‘Participants with arsenic skin lesion were selected randomly using the database from an ongoing randomized clinical trial conducted in Laksam, Comilla.’

9. On the page 4, paragraph 4, the line 5 should write as, ‘That cohort enrolled apparently healthy participants (both male and female) with a history of drinking water for at least three years from the same tube-well within the age limit of 18-65 years.’

10. The study recruited apparently healthy participants (both male and female) from both the study area? What do you mean by ‘apparently healthy participants’ and what is the significance of mentioning this in the ‘study area and population sub-section”? Do you mean that unhealthy individuals were excluded from the study? In that case, you need to be specific. It is preferred to mention as ‘inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study participants’.

11. On the page 5, 2nd paragraph, the first sentence should write as, ‘Considering 80% power, 5% level of significance, unexposed/exposed ratio of 1, percent of unexposed with outcome 30 and percent of exposed with outcome 50 using the “OpenEpi” version 2.2 software (Developer: Emory University, Rollins School of Public Health) the sample size was calculated [20]’.

12. The paper mentioned that, ‘The first step was to identify and discard potential outliers. Using face validity, some outliers appeared on both sides of the bell curve.’ This is not accepted. The authors need to mention why they discarded the outliers. Is it due to data entry error or whether these outliers are not biologically plausible? If inclusion of outliers affects the distribution of the variable, this needs to be dealt with appropriate statistical technique.

13. On the page 5, 2nd paragraph, lines 11-12, the sentence should be written as, ‘Using the range of 35 - 51 years, the rest were discarded.’

Data collecting procedure:

14. On the page 5, 3rd paragraph, lines 15-17 should be written as, ‘Detail menopausal history and socio-demographic information was collected using close-ended structured questionnaires consisting of easy to understand questions with appropriate response options.’

15. On the page 5, 3rd paragraph, lines 25-27 should be written as, ‘Moreover, interviewers were kept blinded to the objectives of the study and in addition to that, enough time was allocated for the interviewers to conduct each interview’.
Exposure assessment:
16. The paper has determined arsenic exposure as the presence or absence of arsenic skin lesions which has been used as a measure of exposure in the past by some researchers. However, I believe that arsenic concentration of their drinking water sources is also available for this study population as they have been recruited from a well-designed RCT and a Cohort study. Therefore, it would be worthwhile to explore the association between chronic arsenic exposure determined by drinking water arsenic concentration and age of natural menopause in addition to the arsenic skin lesions.

Outcome assessment:
17. On the page 6, 3rd paragraph, the first sentence should be written as, ‘Natural menopause was determined according to the World Health Organization (WHO) definition “Permanent cessation of menstruation resulting from the loss of ovarian follicular activity” which corresponds to a single point in time- the final menstrual period (FMP) [24].'

18. The outcome variable was measured based on self-reported age of natural menopause. Hence, there is a risk of recall bias through differential recall of natural age of menopause among women with arsenic lesions. This should be mentioned as a limitation in the study and how it may affect the study finding. Although you have mentioned it on page 6, paragraph 1, line 9, this does not ensure accuracy of self-reporting.

Covariate and other variables:
19. On the page 6, 4th paragraph, the first and second sentences should be written as, ‘Several studies suggest that a number of factors may affect natural menopausal age such as smoking, educational attainment, income, marital status, employment, parity, contraceptives use, family history of premature menopause, cancer and history of chemotherapy or radiotherapy and body mass index [25-33]. Among these, a few factors such as smoking, parity, marital status, income, use of contraceptive methods, body mass index and family history of premature menopause prevailed among the respondents.’

20. On the page 7, lines 3-4 should be written as, ‘Socio-demographic information such as number of children, education, marital status, monthly household income was collected.’

21. The paper mentions that they asked the participants whether their mother or sister had experienced premature menopause. I wonder how accurate it would be to obtain information on menopausal history of family members from the study participants! This needs to be mentioned as a limitation of the study in the discussion section.

Statistical analysis:
22. Overall, appropriate statistical analyses have been done. However, some of the analyses need further explanation.
23. Please replace the words 'multivariate linear regression' by 'multivariable linear regression' throughout the manuscript.

24. Please replace the words 'dependent variable' by 'outcome variable' throughout the manuscript.

25. The authors need to mention whether the outcome variable 'age of natural menopause' was normally distributed or not. If the outcome variable was not normally distributed, then appropriate statistical measure needs to be taken.

26. On the page 8, lines 1-3, the authors mentioned that, 'Although participant’s age difference was statistically significant (p <.001) between two groups, we did not include participant’s age in the final model because age of menopause was our variable of interest.' This is not appropriate as participant’s age is an explanatory variable in this linear regression analysis whereas the age of natural menopause is the outcome variable. Therefore, you need to include participant’s age as an explanatory variable in the regression analysis.

Ethical review

27. The paragraph should be written as, 'The study protocol and recruitment procedure (access to the databases) was approved by the Ethical Review Board of the James P Grant School of Public Health, BRAC University as per the existing rules.'

Results

28. The first sentence should be written as, 'Participants background information is presented in Table 1. Mean age (+ SD) of the respondents was 48.0(+ 3.6) years. Mean age (+ SD) of menarche, menopause and reproductive period was 14.00 + 1.36, 44.95 + 3.35 and 30.94 + 3.51, respectively.

29. Please report the monthly household income in US$ along with Bangladeshi taka.

30. On the page 9, first and second sentences should be written as, 'Continuous variables such as body mass index (BMI) was found significantly lower (p =.03) among women with arsenic skin lesion (18.93 + 3.03) in comparison to women without arsenic skin lesion (19.94 + 3.48). However, urinary arsenic levels were found significantly higher (p = 0.001) among individuals with arsenic skin lesion (328.01 + 284.17) in comparison to individuals without arsenic skin lesion (156 + 193.00).

31. On the page 9, 2nd paragraph, first and second sentences should be written as, 'Mean difference of age of menarche, age of menopause, and reproductive age of the participants are presented in Table 4. Age of menarche was similar (p=0.06) between two groups, however the menopausal age (p <0.001) and reproductive period (p <0.001) were different between the groups.'

32. On the page 9, lines 11-13 should be written as, 'Approximately, 1.9 years
decrease in reproductive period (p = 0.001) occurred among participants with arsenic skin lesion (29.99 + 3.31 years) compared to participants without arsenic skin lesion (31.91 + 3.48 years).

33. On the page 9, lines 13 - 14 should be written as, 'Multivariable linear regression model was undertaken to adjust for all the potential confounders presented in Table 5.'

34. Table 2 describes the study population adequately. Therefore, Table 1 should be removed. Additionally, Table 4 should be merged with the proposed Table 1.

35. Please prepare all the 'Tables' according to the journal's recommended format. All the numbers with decimal point should be presented in a uniform manner.

36. Table 3, regarding the variable 'smoking' one cell contains a 'zero' value. Did you consider that in your analysis? Fisher's exact test may be an appropriate test for this. The reported 'p' value is '1' which is very unlikely. It is better to report the 'p' value as <0.001.'

37. Table 3 also reports about 'number of children'. The authors need to report whether this number of children was normally distributed or not?

38. At the bottom of Tables 1-3, the authors do not need to mention ‘∗p = <0.05’ as they have reported the actual 'p' values in the tables.

39. Table 4 should be merged with the proposed Table 1 as I have mentioned earlier.

40. Table 5, the first row about the 'constant' should be removed from the table. At the bottom of the Table, please replace the words 'Dependent Variable' by 'Outcome variable' as I have mentioned earlier.

Discussion

41. On the page 13, second sentence should be written as, 'An overall 3.5 months of delay was observed on the menarcheal age (p = 0.06) among the participants.'

42. On the page 14, lines 3 - 4 should be written as, 'Although we did not have reliable data on their arsenical skin lesion at the time of their menarche, however in……'.

43. On the page 14, lines 8 – 9 should be written as, 'Secondly, our finding revealed that chronic arsenic exposure seems to have a relationship with the menopausal age.'

44. On the page 14, lines 11 – 14 should be written as, 'Mean reproductive period was 1.9 years lower among the participants with arsenic skin lesions compared to the participants without arsenic skin lesion. The finding was also similar in the multivariable linear regression analysis.'
45. On the page 14, lines 14 - 19 should be written as, ‘This result suggests that chronic exposure to arsenic, as marked by the presence of skin lesions is associated with early menopause, that means holding all other potential confounders constant, women with arsenic skin lesion would experience 2.1 years early menopause than the women without arsenic skin lesion. Therefore, these women are at higher risk of developing non-communicable diseases including cardiovascular diseases, neurological diseases, osteoporosis and psychiatric diseases earlier in their lives compared to the women without arsenic skin lesion [17].’

46. On the page 15, lines 2 - 4 should be written as, ‘Arsenic also may cross placental barriers and exposure to this toxicant may occur when the foetus is still within the mother’s womb, although its effects may visibly appear much later in life [35, 37].’

47. On the page 15, line 5 should be written as, 'In this study, all the participants with or without arsenic skin lesion have high urinary arsenic……'.

48. On the page 15, line 13 should be written as, ‘… and this long-term arsenic exposure is more important to consider for certain health conditions than recent exposure.’

49. On the page 15, lines 17 - 19 should be written as, 'Another positive issue was the adjustment for relevant early menopausal risk factors among the study women such as number of children, family history of premature menopause, use of contraceptives, urinary arsenic level and BMI.'

50. On the page 15, lines 19 - 20 should be written as, ‘As participants (with or without arsenic skin lesion) were selected randomly, selection bias was less likely to occur.’

51. On the page 15, lines 20 – 22 the authors have written, ‘It would be desirable to have menopausal data with or without arsenic skin lesion participants over time. In the absence of any reliable data on menopause in the past, it had to rely on individual’s recall.’ These sentences do not make any sense as menopause does not occur over time. Furthermore, the authors may follow my previous comments on potential recall bias and write about this recall bias as a limitation here.

52. On the page 15, lines 26 - 27 should be written as, ‘As this is a cross-sectional study, temporality between arsenic exposure and menopause cannot be claimed.’

53. Finally, the manuscript should be prepared according to the recommended format of the journal.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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