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Author’s response to reviews:

COVER LETTER

July 3, 2019

Dear Dr. Robin L. Cassady-Cain,

I am writing in regard to my revise and resubmit submission of an original research article to BMC Women’s Health titled, “The myth of menstruation: How menstrual regulation and suppression impact contraceptive choice.” (BMWH-D-18-00531)

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. We appreciated both reviewer’s comments and believe this guidance greatly strengthened the paper and improved the novel contributions it can bring to the existing literature, and specially BMC Women’s Health subscribers and readers.

We hope you and the reviewers find we have adequately addressed all comments, and exceeded all expectations with our revisions.

Thank you for your continued consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Andrea L. DeMaria, PhD, MS
Assistant Professor
RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS BELOW

To the reviewers and editor: Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript! We appreciated the feedback and comments, and believe this guidance strengthened the paper immensely. We have thoughtfully addressed each of the reviewers’ comments below. You will also find all additions/edits to the manuscript written in track changes throughout the revised document.

Inaki Lete (Reviewer 1):

This is a well written well designed study that deserves its publication. There are some minor corrections I would like suggesting the authors:

Thank you for the support of our work. We hope you find our revisions exceed your expectations. We appreciate your suggestions that helped improve our manuscript.

The references are not enough updated. 10 up to 43 references are within the last 5 years but the other 33 are older. To my knowledge there are recent publications focused on this topic: women preferences about menstrual bleeding. Please update the references list and the references in the text.

Thank you for drawing our attention to this. We have updated our citations throughout to ensure all references are recent publications on the topic.

Guenter Freundl, M.D. (Reviewer 2):

I think you should shorten your paper a little.

Thank you for this recommendation. We have conducted a thorough edit to reduce the word count, which we feel has improved the clarity and cohesion.

In contrast to the introduction of the paper that is a field where a lot of publications already appeared in European Journals or books. The work of f.e. Georgetown University, Washington, Victoria Jennings or in Europe Roetzer/ Vienna, Doering/ Munich, Marshall/ UK, Billings/ Australia, Klann, Frank- Herrmann, AG NFP/ Koeln should be mentioned.
Thank you for noting these scholars and their excellent work. We have included the references we believe related throughout, which has furthered the scope of the work.

The TBP is only one way to get informations on this problem. Therefore shorten the Introduction of the paper and also the description of the methods.

We have reduced both sections accordingly.

Please make the literature research more worldwide and not only in the context of US. As we updated our references, we have made sure to include global research. We appreciate your recommendation.

The material researched includes only 600 women altogether, which is a very small basis for such a basic question.

Yes, we agree. We also feel the information does contribute to the growing body of literature, and have made sure to highlight this as a limitation.

In the discussion the worldwide knowledge in this field should be included.

We have further built out our implications to include the worldwide knowledge impacts. Thank you for highlighting this as a contribution.