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Reviewer's report:

Firstly, I would like to commemorate the authors for conducting this project on a population that has received little research and policy attention in the previous years.

As stated in the Standards of Reporting policy, the authors should review the manuscript and ensure it meets the required guidelines from the STROBE Statement.

Title
Please indicate the study's design in the title.

Abstract
Methods: Within the methods section of the abstract, it states that recruitment occurred between October to November 2017, however within the Methods section of the manuscript it states October to December 2017. Please clarify.
Conclusions: How does the conclusion in the abstract relate to the broader topic? This section is a bit vague and doesn't bring the significance of the results to the forefront.

Introduction
The introduction reads well and provides an overview of the topic area. Suggestion to swap the sentences around on line 55-57 with the sentence on 58-60 as this section relates more to the impact of endometriosis on women's lives. It seems to jump from the impact to prevalence to impact again.
The aim of the study is not clearly stated. It does not mention that it is being conducted on endometriosis suffers.

Methods
Please refer to the STROBE guidelines for appropriate amendments where needed.
Recruitment was conducted through Qualtrics, however some readers may not be aware of this company. Did Qualtrics have any involvement with the social media posts? What was there role in this study? Was this just a data collection site/survey platform?
Define modalities in its first instance in the methods. To a clinician it reads as a discipline for
treatment. Survey domain is more appropriate in this case.
Line 84 stated that there was 6 months recall, however line 90 states 12 months. Please clarify.
How was the adverse events categorised? Which program did you use for this free text? Please clarify
on how analysis occurred drawing on the requirements in the STROBE guidelines.
What was statistical significance set at? A simple sentence would be ideal.

Results
Table 1: Requirements amendment as there are no headings and include both SD and percentages. Can
the PPIQ scores be presented in the same manner as the rest of the demographics for readability? If not,
a separate line with the headings relating to this would be suitable.
Line 138-141: Please add in the results for the less effective interventions. This section displays some
but not others.
Line 147-149: Is unclear. Please revise for clarity. The use of percentages and statements makes it
confusing to the reader.
Line 149: What other treatments were less effective? Please provide examples.
Table 4: Does Table 4 N/A refer to not application or no data? Please clarify which.

Conclusion
The conclusion reads well and would be suitable to have the abstract conclusion state similar
statements.

Grammar and Spelling
There a some minor amendments to the sentence structure. A grammar check would address this. For
example line 22 finishes with "many women" and line 23 starts with "many women", line 152 states
"just over half" removing the term just from this section and through out should be considered to
strengthen the language of the 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.

Yes

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

Yes
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:
Acceptable
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