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**Reviewer's report:**
General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1. The whole structure of the paper is not correct. Most of what is included in the discussion is general knowledge on contraception, disadvantages and advantages of different methods. It could be a brief section in the introduction and then referred to in the discussion. Very little of the results from the study is discussed. The discussion and introduction parts both need a major revision.

The Introduction and discussion sections were revised according to reviewers suggestions. Study of results were discussed more entirely.

2. Methods is unclear and important parts are missing as a clear description of population and sample. No mentioning of response rates. Nothing about ethical approval. Nothing about the instrument and little about the procedure. Analysis not mentioned. This needs to be revised.

Information about ethical approval, instruments, procedure and analysis were included to Methods.

3. The population is described as perimenopausal women who had history of amenorrhea for less than two years, but reading further on it is clear that also women with regular menstruation were included.

Study population were described clearly in methods.

4. The aim of the study would suit better as the last part of the introduction.

The aim of the study was placed in the last part of the introduction.
5. Results; last sentence talks about increase in number of births but no results support this statement.

Information about these results were removed from the manuscript.

6. Curettage is not defined. What were the indications?

Information about these results were removed from the manuscript.

7. Discussion; fecundity begins to decrease at age 40, is not correct, has already decreased substantially at age 40.

Done

8. Some statements are made without supporting evidence such as "perimenopausal women in Turkey are nor showing real interest in..." or "it is not a popular method... only an expensive alternative available to attendants of private clinics".

References were given for these statements.

9. Other statements are unlogical to me. Why would perceived unattractiveness be an obstacle to use a female condom? Withdrawals stressfulness is connected with irregular bleeding but what is stressful must be the use of an unreliable contraceptive method?

References were given for these statements.

10. Language needs to be checked.

Language was checked by an expert in English.

11. I would like the demographics to be better explained and commented on. How come almost 40% of the women have CVD? What kind of CVD? Also not included in the abbreviations. Smoking and alcohol. How was the question? Ever use?

Abbreviations were explained. Smoking and alcohol, exercise use items were included in table 1. High rates of cardiovascular problems in our study population is not surprising because of their age group. Kinds of CVD's were explained in Table 1.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. Results: Do not start a sentence with a number.

Done

2. Withdrawal was most used, not sure it was the most popular? Discussion: second para: pregnancy in this age group is associated with...

Done
3. NHS data are from Turkey which should be clear.

Done

4. Table 3 Unclear. Are the numbers presented N or percentages. What differences are the p-value and the X referred to?

Done

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

An article Level of interest: of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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General

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

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)

This study is very relevant. The title and abstract were well written. The methodology is acceptable. The tables are relevant.

However the first two pages on the discussion (pages 4 & 5) are more like literature review instead of discussing the results in the study. I suggest that the authors modify these first two pages of the discussion to focus more on discussing the results and then comparing their findings with other Works done. The manuscript is otherwise acceptable for publication.

The introduction and discussion sections were revised according to reviewers suggestions. Study of results were discussed more entirely.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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