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Reviewer's report:

The authors make a survey on hygiene-related behaviours and products in Canada and the impact on vaginal health in Canada.

Only female should be included, because in transgender there are bias of medical/hormonal therapy etc.

There is a selection bias due to internet advertisement (Facebook) and voluntary particiaption. Younger women are over-represented. How many are postmenopausal and take estrogens?

Please add the information on how long or regular the hygiene products were used, the exposition time and frequencs are important.

There is an interpretation problem, especially in Conclusions. The results of this survey identify the high prevalence of vaginal health and hygiene related behaviours among individuals with adverse vaginal symptoms or infections. So it seems that this risk group uses more hygiene products, whereas it does not mean that hygiene products have an adverse effect on vaginal health. A prospective or case control study would be appropriate to analyse the correlation between hygiene products and vaginal health.

One explanation for a possible correlation between vaginal infection and douching would be micro-traumas by douching etc.

Please explain the next steps for the evidence based evaluation of the presented topic.

Please explain abbreviations: f.e. LGBTQ (line 20).

Only 17 references, should be extended.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

No

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

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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