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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.
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.
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.
4. The aim of the study would suit better as the last part of the introduction.
5. Results; last sentence talks about increase in number of births but no results support this statement.
6. Curettage is not defined. What were the indications?
7. Discussion; fecundity begins to decrease at age 40, is not correct, has already decreased substantially at age 40.
8. Some statements are made without supporting evidence such as "perimenopausal women in Turkey are not showing real interest in..." or "it is not a popular method... only an expensive alternative available to attendants of private clinics".
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?
10. Language needs to be checked.
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?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.
2. Withdrawal was most used, not sure it was the most popular?
3. NHS data are from Turkey which should be clear.
4. Table 3 Unclear. Are the numbers presented N or percentages. What differences are the p-value and the X referred to?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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
Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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

Statistical review: No