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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript entitled "Too much time? Time use and fertility-specific quality of life among men and women seeking specialty care for infertility" describes a cross-sectional survey conducted in a Reproductive Medicine Center in Wisconsin.

The main aim of the study was to investigate gender (men vs. women) differences in the amount of time spent on various activities in connection with family-building (including researching options, personal reflection, discussing family-building with a partner, discussing family-building with others, and dealing with logistics).

A further purpose was to analyse the impact of time use on fertility-specific quality of life and general anxiety, after considering the role played by individual characteristics and relationship satisfaction.

The research presented is interesting and the paper is overall well written, although some limits reduce my enthusiasm and several points should be improved:

- A serious flaw of the study deals with the acceptance rate: as specified by Authors, the participation to the study was proposed to 613 patients of the Reproductive Medical Center, but only 155 of them (i.e. 25.29%) responded and were screened for eligibility. Authors should more carefully consider and comment on this limit of their study, as it seriously affects generalisability of their findings.

- In the Method Section Authors do not specify if participants had previous children born without assisted reproductive technology, as they only stated that having previous children born through assisted reproductive technology was an exclusion criterion. This information might be important also in order to consider some results. For instance, Authors found that older men and women reported better well-being and they concluded that "This may be a reflection of the overall trends in mental health improving with age. Alternatively or additionally, patients who are seeking specialty care for infertility at a later age have lived a longer time child-free, which may make it easier to cope with infertility" (page 14, lines 12-20). Why do Authors not consider that these older men and women should have had a child born naturally (also in previous relationships) and this may affect their well-being?

- In the Measures section, reliability values of all the questionnaires are missing.
- An interesting result in the current research is represented by the fact that time spent in discussion with others is associated with better social quality of life for men. A few previous studies dealt with the association between distress and lack of openness about infertility among men undergoing ART treatment. Authors might deepen this suggestion, in order to better emphasise their data.

- In the Discussion Section, Authors should more extensively present the clinical implications of their research.

In addition, the following minor concerns should be addressed in order to improve the manuscript:

- page 4 line 7: Authors should specify what they intend with "reporting anxiety or depression". Do they refer to higher anxious and depressive levels in infertile women if compared with fertile women or to a diagnosis of depression and/or anxiety?

- In the Measures section, Authors should better explain what they intend with the "research" and the "logistic" scales of the questionnaire they created, because these scales are not self-explanatory as the other three items are.

- In the Measures section, the Couples Satisfaction Index should be more extensively presented.

- page 9 lines 11-16: please, check for grammar.

- In the Results Section, Authors do not comment on findings about mind/body and relational scales of FertiQoL of both men and women.

- page 13, line 29: please check for grammar (quality of life instead of quality and life).

- page 13, lines 46-51: in my opinion, this sentence is not clear.
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