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Reviewer's report:

This study is examining risk factors for ectopic pregnancy in an attempt to update the list of known risk factors, particularly in relation to assisted reproduction techniques. Ectopic is an important cause of maternal morbidity and mortality. It is well designed and laid out and the methodology is mostly sound. In some places the grammar needs addressing.

The figures and tables are clearly laid out and the results and conclusions add to the literature on risk factors for ectopic pregnancy.

Study design and participants: I am unsure why the cases and controls were matched with such a wide age band (5 yrs) as the incidence of ectopic may well be affected by age and there may be some bias attached to this - the authors need to explain the reason for this and why they do not feel that this was a problem. I am unclear why marital status was important.

It is also not clear how the sample size was calculated.

Oral contraceptives appear to be lumped into one group and should have been split as the risk of ectopic may well be different between the progesterone only and the combined pill. Whilst the authors point this out in the discussion they have not really addressed how this might affect the results.

In the multivariate analysis there is mention of chinese herbs as part of fertility treatment: the details of this as a treatment will only be obvious to those health care professionals used to using chinese herbs and warrants a more detailed explanation of the relevance of this.

Conclusion: the conclusion concentrates on IVF_ET only and seems to forget about the other significant results and therefore appears a bit disjointed from the text - rather like it has been plucked from somewhere else. It needs to reflect the original aims of the study not just one significant finding.

Major compulsory revisions: none

Minor essential revisions: see comments above

Discretionary revisions: none
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