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Reviewer's report:

Interesting paper as it addresses a topic of clinical importance at a time when participants may be under considerable stress and therefore unwilling to contemplate participation in research so well done for managing to get many to respond.

I like the presentation of the results and the introduction of the quotes in the table rather than the text. I would like to know why the authors used excel and not N6 which is a specialist software for handling qualitative data. Can you please comment on the analytic framework for the analysis? It would seem to me to be content analysis?

The clarity could be enhanced by a summary presentation of the trial and its findings. Also I would like to see more discussion/presentation of the potential ethical issues around contacting participants in distress. Some statements are made throughout but worth considering all of those issues under 1 heading.

As some women appeared to have difficulty in understanding the randomisation process, how was that considered in the trial overall?
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