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Dear Deborah Saltman, MD PhD

Please find enclosed a copy of the manuscript entitled "Perimenopausal Contraception In Turkish Women: Cross-sectional Study" for consideration as an article in “BMC Nursing” in September 20, 2006.

Manuscript has been revised according to comment.
We herewith declare that the manuscript is not submitted to any other journal for review at present and that its language has been reviewed by a professional. The approval and permission of the subjects, who participated in the study, were obtained prior to the initiation of our studies.

Thanking you in advance for your kind efforts we look forward to hearing from you regarding the outcome of the review process.

Sincerely yours

Address:
Nevin Hotun Sahin
Florence Nigtingale Hemsirelik Yuksekokulu
Dogum ve Kadin Hastaliklari Hemsireligi ABD
Sisli 34387, Istanbul, Turkiye
Telephone: +(90) 212 440 00 00/27082,
Fax: +(90) 212 224 4990

E-mail: nevinsah@istanbul.edu.tr
nevinsahin34@yahoo.com
Reviewer's report

Title: Perimenopausal Contraception In Turkish Women: A cross-sectional Study

Version: 4 Date: 6 December 2006

Reviewer: Margareta Larsson

Reviewer's report:

General
I do not consider the manuscript ready for publication yet.

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

1. Minor changes were made in the discussion whereas my suggestion was a major rewrite. The discussion is still too much of an introduction with an overview of different contraceptive methods. Results are very briefly mentioned. A discussion could start with a short paragraph summarizing the main findings. Thereafter the results are discussed in the same order as they are presented in the result section, put in relation to other studies and in this case data from DHS. The authors should ask themselves the question: What does this mean?, pointing out if their findings are in line with other studies or contradict them and what clinical and practical implications the findings may have. Move most of the overview of contraceptive methods to the introduction and shorten it. Introduction was shortened and discussion was rewritten according to this suggestion. Main findings was discussed with other studies and DHS, and clinical and practical implications were added.

2. The method still needs to be better explained. How did the researchers get in touch with the women and how were they selected? This is important information in order to judge if the findings are representative for Turkish women. Did some women decline participation? If so, how many and why and what implications could it have on the results?

The method was explained better with the information about detail. The findings aren’t representative of all perimenopausal for Turkish women. Further studies with a larger sample would strengthen the study’s results.

No women declined to participate in the study. We only taken the exclusion and selection criteria into consideration. Women who had surgical menopause were excluded.

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. The analysis ... using descriptive statistics. No tests were done??

   We added “Analyses were computed for demographic characteristics using percentage.” in method

2. Abstract: Do not start a sentence with "because". The two first sentences can be combined. The software can be removed from the abstract.

   Done

3. Check the language in the abstract, delete "baring in mind"

   Done

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)