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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read this paper. I think some of the results are very interesting and worth discussing.

My main topics about the paper:

The rational for doing this?

Is this of interest for readers and researcher worldwide or are the results mainly of interest for the German society? My suggestion is to public in a more suitable paper for the German public. The introduction is much to long and focus on the situation when the Thalidomide was introduces and withdrawn from the German market. I do believe that this done in many countries after the alarms about the impact on the children.

Way not included the affected men also?

There is a problem not knowing if the women are investigating twice or have only answered the questioners once.

The number of participates.

The financial compensation for the women -have they received that from the state? Is that a factor not working and maybe work part time. I think there need to be control group of a twice as many women from the ordinary population that also needs to be age matched. Also there needs to be a discussion in health care and assistance - the possibility to get assistances. Is it a problem in Germany and might it be a financial question?

The strength in this study is that the investigation has been thorough and performed by professionals. And also it is a well written paper.
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 am able to assess the statistics

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