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Reviewer’s report

Major compulsory revisions

This is an interesting paper and the area of sexual function amongst breast cancer survivors is important. This can be published with a re-jig of the discussion.

The main criticism I have is that the discussion is not well structured. The discussion of the results should come first and there needs to be mention of strengths and weaknesses of the study and a conclusion/further research needed. There are a lot of results and these are not adequately discussed.

Minor essential revisions

Introduction para 1 &2 should be amalgamated as repeat ‘second most common malignancy not necessary.

Word missing para 2 line 5 ‘ most...neoplasm’

Para3 first line postmenopausal women would sound better. The sentence doesn’t read well.

Is the relationship controversial between rx and symptoms?

Need to state aim in the introduction

Materials and methods

Why is it nested study? Is it part of a larger study? The study is rather small with only 24 breast cancer patients. Can you comment?

From how many patients were the participants recruited ie denominator

Inclusion criteria for control, why did they have to be HT free when the BC cases were not? Was previous use acceptable?

Was prior diagnosis of BC acceptable?

Define ECOG

Results

Table 8 mention prior diagnosis but not mentioned elsewhere, what do you mean? Did you include women with recurrence of BC?
Discussion
Should re-state and discuss the main findings are in the first paragraph before launch into discussion of the literature.
5th paragraph, is the term psychic wellbeing what you mean?
Para 10 regiments should be regimens
What are the strengths and weaknesses of this study?
What are the main conclusions?
Discretionary revisions
The discussion could be improved by restructuring in the way I suggested.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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