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Reviewer's report:

General:
1. I found the abstract a little confusing. It isn't clear what the role of the National Health Interview Survey is.
   Then, in the results section of the abstract the wording is confusing. It should be worded, something like Of 504 women treated for menopause, xx were prescribed HRT before release of the WHI and xx were prescribed HRT after WHI.

2. Methods section:
   First, it isn't clear what data was collected from the NHIS...Was this used to collect demographic and educational data?
   Then, it isn't clear why 3439 women were selected from the 23,473 individuals in the general population...Were those all the women in the correct age category?

It seems, overall, that limiting the study to 504 women who sought treatment for menopause during the short study period makes the numbers too small to draw really significant conclusions.

Next, the information about dummy variables used for coding purposes presented in the methods section seems unconventional.

Results section:
I also find that breaking the 504 patients down into those that had visits before during and after the study period is confusing.
I don't think that two logistic regression models should be presented.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The paper needs improvements as noted in the general section above, to make the abstract and methods more clear to the reader.
The results then should also be presented in a more straightforward manner, with the results of the bivariate analysis, then followed by the logistic regression.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the
major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

**Statistical review:** No
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