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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The results section in the abstract is slightly unclear. At one point the authors talk about more women with OASIS reporting AI, sexual pain and less desire compared to women without OASIS. However, percentages and odds ratios are presented in the same sentence. The interpretation of the OR in this case is very confusing and unclear.

2. Is it valid to create an overall sexual problem score by adding up likert scales and then categorising the overall score? Is this a validated method?

3. In Table 2, sexual problems were measured on a likert scale, summed and then categorised, yet the ORs are reported in terms of unit increase in score point. This is a categorical variable and it should be analysed as a categorical variable.

4. The second aim was to assess if episiotomy characteristics were associated with AI, UI and sexual problems. Why were episiotomy characteristics and dysfunctions investigated over all patients rather than comparing women with OASIS with women without OASIS? I think it would be much more interesting to look at episiotomy characteristics and OASIS.

5. Spearmans correlation was carried out to estimate correlation but was any modelling of the data conducted? No adjustment seems to have been made here or anywhere in the manuscript for any other factors (e.g. age, birth weight etc. in which significant differences between the groups have been seen).
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