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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Assistant Editor

We sincerely appreciate your valuable comments on our manuscript entitled: “Factors Associated with Quality of Life of Postmenopausal Women Living in Iran”. We have provided a revised version based on these comments, along with a response (R) to the comments and hope that the responses meet your expectations.

Technical Comments:

Editor Comments:
The reviewers have expressed positive comments regarding the revised version of your article. Nevertheless, some of the reviewers still have some concerns: for this reason, I invite authors to perform these additional minor revisions, taking into account the suggestions of the reviewers.

BMC Women’s Health operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Akmal El-Mazny (Reviewer 1): Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this interesting study "Factors Associated with Quality of Life of Postmenopausal Women Living in Iran". However, I have some minor comments and recommendations:

Title:
- Is appropriate for the content of the article.

Abstract:
- Represents a suitable summary of the work.
Article content:
- The design, methods and analysis of the results are appropriate for the study.

Conclusions:
- Are justified on the basis of the results of the study.

References:
- Update some references.
R- References were updated. 11 old references were deleted and 17 new references were added.

General:
- Revise language, grammar and syntax.
R- The paper was corrected by an English editor.

Daniela Yela (Reviewer 3): Congratulations for this paper.
Need to correct in the summary and in the methods: whoqol-bref
R- The correction was made. The questionnaire’s name was written based on the reference available at: https://www.who.int/substance_abuse/research_tools/whoqolbref/en/

Need to improve the first paragraph of the results
R- The revision was made.

Correct table 4 since the total is not 405 (265+ 136 = 401 and 303 + 101 = 404)
R- The total number of participants in this table is not 405 because some subjects did not respond to socioeconomic variables.

Elżbieta Grochans, Ph.D. (Reviewer 5): The authors supplemented the data referred to in the previous review.
The study is methodologically correct, the results are well-described. The conclusions are too general and need to be slightly corrected—they should refer to the examined group only. Anyway, the studied women are a very interesting group, and the variables taken into account give a very interesting view on postmenopausal women's problems.

R- The section of conclusions was revised.

Best regards.