Reviewer’s report

Title: Vaginal douching and racial/ethnic disparities in phthalates exposures among reproductive-aged women: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey 2001-2004

Version: 2
Date: 22 February 2015

Reviewer: Laura Vandenberg

Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed the concerns I raised during my first review. Although their new analysis separating timing of the menstrual cycle revealed some very interesting results, I understand their desire not to include these new findings in the manuscript.

Discretionary Revisions

This might seem incredibly picky, but I would still edit this sentence on page 4: “Moreover, a recent study of DEP toxicity in adult female rats found evidence of estrogenicity in both in vitro and in vivo systems suggesting that DEP may induce reproductive abnormalities in female reproductive system by both genomic and nongenomic mode of actions [8].” If the study was performed in female rats, it really wasn’t in vitro… I suggest changing this sentence to say, “Moreover, a recent study of DEP toxicity found evidence of estrogenicity in both in vitro and in vivo, in adult female rats, suggesting that DEP may induce reproductive abnormalities in female reproductive system by both genomic and nongenomic mode of actions [8].”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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