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Reviewer's report:

General
I think that the revisions made are an improvement to the study. I still have some concerns regarding originality but there is a paucity of research in this area and without doubt this study does provide new information. The high proportion of women who have consulted previously about "a period problem" makes the sample similar to that studied in the O'Flynn and Britten paper although with further aspects of menstruation analysed. The fact that such a large proportion of women had consulted makes it more relevant to clinicians. The consultation rate is high and doesn't concur with their statement in the background "others have commented on how many women with heavy menstrual bleeding to (typo error) not consult their doctors (4)".

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The data concerning the number of women who had consulted a GP at some time in the past should be incorporated. The following sentences suggested by the authors should be added "Overall, according to their questionnaire responses, 12 interviewees had consulted their general practitioner about periods within the previous 6 months. Of those who had not reported consulting on the questionnaire, a further 12 said at interview that they had discussed periods with their general practitioner at some time in the past".

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

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: Acceptable

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