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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

i. Methods – The description of the recruitment and inclusion criteria for the cases and the controls still requires more details. The description ‘attending the routine gynecologic clinic’ is too vague. Over what time period were the controls recruited? How many clinics? How were the clinics selected? Were there any exclusion criteria?

ii. Methods – Please provide response rates for the cases and the controls separately?

Table 1 – the percentages for contraceptive use do not seem to be correct. Eg 11.1% should be 11.3%, 2.5% should be 1.7%, 4.3% should be 4.2%. Secondly there are 22 missing values for cases and 7 for controls which should be added to the table for completeness.

Table 2 – please also check the % in this table as they do not seem to correspond with the values given in Table 1 (either with/without inclusion of the missing values).

Minor essential revision

Table 3 – please include in the table the comparison group in each analysis as it is not possible to interpret the results without this information. For example for hormonal contraceptive use: Never HC use OR 1.0, for Length of exposure: 1-4 years HC use OR 1.0.

Discretionary revision

Table 3 - the customary approach for assessing a dose response would be to show the odds ratios for 1-4 years use and then >4 years use compared to never use. It is not clear why the authors have chosen only to show >4 versus 1-4 years use.

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