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Reviewer's report:

Major Revision:
I was surprised to read in the background section “…there are no relevant studies on the risk factors for EP in the region of Shanghai, China.” This statement seems to suggest that there are no published studies, yet the same authors have recently published a similar study which investigated the risk factors for ectopic pregnancy in women with planned pregnancy. This study was neither referenced nor mentioned in the current manuscript.

Online link: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301211514004217
Given the strong similarity between the previous and current study, the authors should cite their previous work, both in the background and discussion sections.

However, given their two published studies on the risk factors for ectopic pregnancy in women with planned pregnancy, and on contraceptive use and the risk of ectopic pregnancy, it is unclear what knowledge gap would be left in the area of risk factors and ectopic pregnancy?

Female sterilization was investigated as one of the risk factors, but not mentioned as a known risk factors in the background, despite the three large studies in this area, which looked at the cumulative risk of EP in previously sterilized women.

Age is a well-known risk factors and should be mentioned in the background.

The following sentence (line 14): “However, the study designs of previous researches on these subjects as well as the sample size have resulted in an overall ambiguity…” needs to be clearer and less ambiguous.

The results section needs to provide more details for each Table and be better explained and structured.

The clinical implications of the current findings need to be discussed.

Minor Revision:
Were ethics obtained for this study? Please include details.
Various typos – please check the spelling.
**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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