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Reviewer’s report:

This interesting study during a transitional phase in the way in which medical services are provided in China produces similar findings on the influences on hysterectomy rates as those in earlier studies in Western Countries.

Major revisions

1. Methodology

I’m afraid I found the first paragraph confusing and this may have been due to a typo error as it is initially stated that there are 48 level-1 hospitals but then they randomly chose from 48 level-3 hospitals. I suspect they mean level 1. This needs clarification.

The method of random selection was not stated.

29 declined to participate but no reason is given and no data concerning their characteristics (e.g. age if available) to indicate if they differed from the participants.

I did not follow why a woman could not be matched with one from the same work unit. The reason for this introducing bias or confounding should be stated.

There is no information regarding the development, piloting and validation of the questionnaire used.

Minor revisions

1. PHE/HEC

The introduction suggests that these are “screening” examinations for individuals who consider themselves asymptomatic. I feel that there needs to be a further discussion in the introduction concerning the function of these centres and as to whether they deal with symptomatic or asymptomatic individuals. If they are providing a primary care service for symptomatic individuals then the results might suggest an under-utilisation of health care by those not in these scheme rather than an over-use the conclusions seem to point to although the multivariate analysis argues against this.

2. RMB
It would be helpful to give a US dollar equivalent.

Overall I enjoyed reading the paper and feel it is a good study worthy of publication.
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