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**Reviewer's report:**

BMC review

Prevalence and predictors of metabolic abnormalities in Chinese women with PCOS

This is a large number of women from China and has good potential but needs significant revision

The question stated is whether the metabolic abnormalities are greater in women with PCOS than in those without but there is also comparison between women with PCOS from “the community” and those with PCOS from a hospital setting. I think it would be better if the latter was not included in this paper.

**Methods:**

Whilst the paper describes a community based survey there is no description in the methods of how this survey was conducted, how women were recruited or whether there was ethics approval. It only talks about the assessment that occurred in the hospital setting. It is not clear in the methods how criteria such as oligomenorrhoea were defined, whether the same people performed the ultrasounds to decrease subjectivity, how disorders such as NCAH, thyroid dysfunction and hyperprolactinaemia were excluded (what was assessed in medical history and laboratory tests?), were women who were pregnant, using hormonal medication in the last 3 months excluded?

**Results**

There needs to be a table with the multivariate regression results.

Table 1 isn’t discussed in the text.

There is too much information – again it may be best in this paper to focus on PCOS compared with non PCOS

Units of measurement need to be included in tables

**Discussion**

This needs to be more concise and to focus on this study and what is novel in the context of the literature. Don’t introduce new data that hasn’t been included in the results.

Some assistance is required to improve the English expression throughout the paper – it is not always clear what is meant