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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The question posed by the authors was not well defined. Although I understand the paper, the introduction and purpose needs to be more clearly presented and situated.

2. The discussion and conclusions are not adequately supported by the data. You make statements about the implications of the results, but I don’t think that they are able to be made. For example, you talk about the percentage of women who have had discussions, but you don’t know who initiated the discussion… it could actually be that health care workers are targeting these women for the discussion. You’ve made the assumption that it was the woman initiating the conversation.

3. Limitations of the work are not clearly accounted for in the discussion. Although you begin to address these, I don’t think that you have adequately described the limitations and the impact these limitations have on the research and interpretation.

4. Writing needs work. There are several instances where words are missing, punctuation is incorrect, or there are incorrect word choices made. I recommend having a professional copy editor review before re-submission.

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: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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