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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting manuscript. I think this study would be useful for clinicians and is worthy of publication. However, the methods need more detail. I think most of the points I raise will be fairly easy to address.

Abstract: Very minor point: in the abstract the cut-off for CVFSFI is stated as >23.45 rather than < 23.45

Intro: The definition of FSD could be more precise/accurate- suggest reference to McCabe et al, Definitions of Sexual Dysfunctions in Women and Men: A Consensus Statement From the Fourth International Consultation on Sexual Medicine 2015 February 2016 Volume 13, Issue 2, Pages 135-143

Methods: it is stated that women were recruited from a health promotion that provided 'routine checkups for all included women'. Please elaborate - does this mean all women in the local area attend every year - if so are they sent reminder? what proportion attend? Or are women attending because they have a medical problem or they self refer for preventive care? what is meant by 'routine checkup' ie blood pressure check? pap smear? How many women attended the centre over the recruitment period? Who recruited the women and asked if they wanted to do the study and had been sexually active?

How did you determine who to approach - or did you approach all women of a certain age?

What does it mean 'completed the CVFSFI in high quality' ie do you mean completed all questions?

Were questionnaires deidentified? could women have been concerned that the person receiving the questionnaire would know whose response it was - this might be a problem if they had concern that their primary health care provider at the centre might see their responses.

As women were completing the questionnaire in a separate room on site with a physician or volunteer nearby to answer questions, how was it dealt with if women changed their mind about completing the survey? what if they wanted to complete it at home?
Thyroid status: please clarify what levels for TSH T3 and T4 you used for defining subclinical hypothyroidism, and overt hypo/hyperthyroidism. what platform was used for analysis of thyroid hormones and can you give a brief description of the assays performance eg CV values

How did you determine menopausal status - it is mentioned in results but not methods

Statistics: can you pls clarify regarding the logistic regression - did you make separate models for FSD and each of the FSFI domains?

Results: the rate of SCH seems high at 15% given the young age of participants - is this usual for the area? Is the area known for iodine deficiency? pls comment

I think it inaccurate to say that those with a low score were ‘diagnoed with FSD’ as you rightly say the FSFI is a screening tool - consider other terminology such as 'at risk for FSD'

Table 1 - pls provide percentages in each column. What does it mean parity is 1 for both groups

Table 3: From the table its not clear what the reference groups are eg for 'medium depression' is that compared to no depression or everyone else? where youve referred to HT - do you just mean TPO positive or do you mean SCH and TPO+

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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