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Reviewer's report:

This paper summarises the outcome of 360 GP consultations for abnormal uterine bleeding over a two year period showing that in the majority of cases, no investigations are carried out and no treatments are offered, and only a small number of cases are referred to secondary care. What happens to patients with menstrual problems when they are seen by their GPs is not a common topic for publication, so from that point of view, the results are interesting, especially to those of us working in secondary care. The results, however, may not necessarily be applicable to other developed world countries; for instance, the use of drugs such as tranexamic acid and of course the Mirena IUS is probably much more common in Scandinavia and even the UK.

The paper is generally well written, although there is much overlap between the results summarised in the main text and the tables – this could easily be corrected by reducing the text. I would also suggest that the term AVB should be replaced by AUB (Abnormal uterine bleeding) as the latter is the more commonly used terminology.

I have some other minor points to make:

a. The first paragraph too long and should be divided into 2 paragraphs.
b. The authors should explain the format of truncated words (e.g. %fibroid%) referred to on page 4.
c. The authors should define what is meant by PAP2 on page 7.

I am surprised that no treatment was offered in 47% of women complaining of excessive bleeding who were not taking hormonal contraception. This makes me
wonder about one of the other outcomes of the survey, namely the fact that patients rarely returned to see their GP with menstrual bleeding problems could this have been because they knew that treatment was so rarely offered that they went elsewhere? I would be interested to know the authors’ views on this. Overall, no major revisions are needed to this manuscript in my opinion, but I would suggest that addressing the points above would improve the paper’s readability.