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Reviewer's report:

Feedback on the paper titled: Treatment seeking behaviour of unmarried adolescent girls for reproductive health problems in two low performing areas of Bangladesh.

Is the question posed by authors new and well defined?
The question posed is not new. But it is well defined.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes.

Are the data sound and well controlled?
Reasonably good overall but some parts could be tightened.

Does the manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

Are the discussions and conclusions well balanced and supported by the data?
The introduction contains several outdated and inappropriate references. The authors should cite more recent publications.
The methods, data analysis and ethical considerations section read well.
The results section is clearly structured and reads well.
The discussion again contains some outdated and inappropriate references and questionable statements.

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

Is the writing acceptable?
The paper contains numerous and serious grammatical errors.

Level of interest:
This paper adds to the global pool of knowledge and understanding in an area where there are not many publications.
Detailed comments on the paper:

Introduction:
First page:
First line:
Replace the word “constitutes” by the word “constitute”

Fifth line:
Reference 2 does not fully back up the statement made. It is also outdated (12 years old).

Second para:
First line:
This report is 10 years old and was not published in a peer-reviewed journal. Could you cite a more recent paper published in a peer-reviewed journal?

Seventh and eighth lines:
(In response.....in India)
Please note that this is one of a number of initiatives carried out across India.

Third para:
Third line:
Please say something about the study carried out in 2002. The brief mention of a 12 year old report unpublished in a peer reviewed journal is not adequate.

Last line:
The title of reference 3 does not clearly say that this study was about reproductive health signs and symptoms. Please confirm that this is so.

Fourth para:
Third line:
Please say that the reference 6 – the national baseline survey was published 9 years ago.

Fifth line:
The study referred to in reference 7 was not published in a peer reviewed journal in 1999 – 15 years ago. This is way out of date.

Last line:
Please confirm this study addresses sexual and reproductive health. This is not evident from the title.

Fifth para:
Second, fourth and sixth lines:
Reference 9 was published over 10 years ago. Please try to identify and use a more recent reference.
In the fourth line, you have referred to this reference in the current context. That is not correct.

Eighth line:
Reference 10 is not authoritative. Further it is over 15 years old. Please use a more appropriate reference.

Ninth line:
Reference 11 is not complete. It was published over 25 years ago.

Ninth and tenth lines:
You have used the term literature search but you have done no literature search. You have cited one very old document.

Materials and methods:
Eighth line:
Please provide a reference to the study.

Ninth line:
Please specify the services you are referring to here.

Sixth line from the bottom:
Please add the word “into” after the word “those”.

Fourth line from the bottom:
(They were asked……one year) Pleas clarify that this question was posed to the 1600 adolescents and not just to those who had menstrual problems

Second to last line:
Please delete the word “were”

Data analysis:
No suggested changes.

Ethical consideration:
Third line:
Please remove the word “had”

Results:
First para:
First line:
Remove the repetition of the word “had”
Second line:
Remove the word “was”

Fourth line:
Replace the word “both” with “in both”

Second para:
Please rewrite this para saying what was similar in the two areas and what was different.

Third para:

Fourth para:
Please confirm if the 33% refers to those who sought care.

Fifth para (top of page 9):
Please move the sentences: “self-treatment…..indigenous practitioners” to the sixth para.

Sixth para:
No suggested changes.

Discussion:
Para one:
Second line:
Please provide illustrative examples of the wide range of reported problems.

Fifth line:
Please illustrative examples of the variation in the utilization of care.

Para three
First sentence:
(The present study….health facilities): Menstrual problems (first line) are gynaecological problems (third line). But the latter includes other problems as well.

Third line from the bottom:
Replace the word “might” with “possibly, because of”

The last sentence:4
“the study……..similar problems” is not in line with the previous sentence which is about the preference to use pharmacies.

Para three:
First, eighth and twelfth line
Please do not mix up symptoms of STI problems.

Third line:
Reference 14 does not back up the statement

Para four:
This sentence is six lines long. It is also not clear. What is the point you are trying to make?

Para five:
Lines three-four: “mama has already….is available”
Please cite data on this.

Line five:
“Bangladesh…common users” - please provide a reference for this.

Para six:
No comments

Conclusion:
First line:
“Menstrual….adolescents” – This is an overstatement
Fourth line:
Please use another term instead of the word “dependable”

Fifth line:
“A lower proportion…..” Please say in relation to what.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

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