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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have reported on prevalence of dysmenorrhea and predictors of its pain intensity among Palestinian female university students. This study is timely and relevant in view of a dearth of report on this subject from a female palestinian population. Having a report like this from different countries will make international comparison and within-continent pooling of data possible. However, there are some issues regarding this manuscript that need to be addressed before publication.

ABSTRACT

- Line 21 to 22: The statement 'The mean±SD of pain was 64 (80.34%)..............................' is difficult to understand. There is no indication of a mean value or SD in the sentence.

- It will be more helpful to state the specific univariate and multivariate analyses employed. This will make it easier for the reader to make a better sense of the result.

BACKGROUND

- Apart from the first paragraph that presents different definition of dysmenorrhea, there is no attempt to describe dysmenorrhea in a way to enable someone who has not experienced it to understand its nature in terms of presentation, reported predisposing factors, sources of relief, psychological and socio-economic impacts etc. Another paragraph after the first one could be used to do justice to this.

- Line 48: Change 'mong' to 'among'.

METHODOLOGY

- A questionnaire was developed by generating questions from a review of relevant literature. However, there is no report of how this questionnaire was validated. In addition a vivid description of the questionnaire, in terms the nature of response set and whether the questionnaire items were grouped into domains or not, is not provided.
- Copies of the questionnaire were distributed at 7 different sites from 12 to 1 pm over four days. Did the authors involve research assistants? How many were they? How were the copies of questionnaire collected back?

- The authors state that ethical approval was obtained from an institutional review board, but do not specify the board. It is required that the name of an institutional review board is stated.

- The author stated that variables were categorised to facilitate analysis. Were all variables categorised? What was the nature of categorization?

- It is not informative enough to state that univariate and multivariate analyses were employed. It will be more helpful to the reader to specify the univariate and multivariate analyses employed.

- Lines 48-50 (last paragraph): The sentence 'Univariate analysis .................' has to be reviewed.

RESULTS

- Lines 31-38 (First paragraph): The sentence 'When asked about........................................ approximately 800 USD.' has to be reviewed.

- Lines 12-14 (Second paragraph): The sentence 'Univariate analysis .................................. those having no pain.' has to be reviewed.

DISCUSSION

- I suggest the authors find away of summarising the prevalence rates from different countries in the first paragraph of discussion. In stead of reviewing them one by one, the rates could be reported as a range to give a picture of the position of the current finding in the reported range.

- Line 41 (last sentence of the last paragraph): I suggest the authors rephrase the sentence to mean the need to interprete the data with caution.

- Lines 12-17 (First paragraph): The sentence 'A review study ............................. in Bangladesh,' need to be reviewed.

- Lines 17-19 (First paragraph): The sentence 'A study conducted ............................ having moderate to severe pain.' has to be reviewed.

- Lines 58-17 (Second paragraph): The sentence ' In Saudi Arabia, a study conducted ........................ were depressed mood and anger.' has to be reviewed.

- Lines 16-17 (Second paragraph): Change 'reported' to 'report'.

- Lines 55-556 (Third paragraph): Remove 'and its role'.

- Lines 16-16 (Third paragraph): The phrase 'Association between .................... and irregular menses' has to be reviewed.

CONCLUSION

- The conclusion needs to be based on the objectives of the study. Other pieces of information in the form of recommendations could be part of the discussion.
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