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Reviewer’s report:

Globally, this is a well written article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests. It is acceptable for publication in the BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth journal.

Only minor essential revisions are suggested for this paper.

1. Regarding the methods section

The methods are appropriate, however regarding the data collection, would it possible for the co-authors to give more information about the time window used to administer the questionnaires.

2. Regarding the results/ discussion sections

a. If possible, could the authors give information on the non-participants (number, reasons for not participating, sociodemographic data, etc.).

b. In the discussion, authors stated that #The correlation between the QPCQ total score and the Satisfaction subscale score of the PESPC was lower in the Australian group of women compared to the group of Canadian women…. Also, the convergent validity of the QPCQ was not as robust when tested in an Australian population#.

Would it possible to explain differences between the Canadian and the Australian results in assessing validity (differences in participants’ socio-demographic characteristics for example, etc.).
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