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**Reviewer’s report:**

I have read the new version of this article and once again found the content fascinating. The authors have improved the paper structurally. Unfortunately I still feel that the article is not primarily dealing with an ethical issue, but rather the experiences of infertility and infertility treatment and decision-making. I see that another reviewer (AK) has also made this point. I am sorry to say that I think this makes the article unsuitable for this journal. However, although (if the editors agree) this may disappoint the authors, I do think they should submit this article to a journal whose readers would be looking for reports of this kind of research, e.g. the Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology.

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