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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript has now been improved a lot. However, there are still some points that need to be improved.

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The language needs to be checked again, there are mistakes.
The method is still not clearly described. How did the authors get in contact with the respondents? Knocking on their doors, advertising in a newspaper? Going to a women's club?? A sentence about sample size has been added but on what basis was the sample size determined?

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
In the discussion reference is made to a fertility specialist. This is not common in scientific papers and should be changed. Use published references.
Discussion, page six third paragraph the rates are 3.3 % ... etc. What is this referring to?

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
I suggest deleting the sentence about the muscle tonus and diaphragm 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: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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