

Reviewer's report

Title: Does improved functional performance help to reduce urinary incontinence in institutionalized older women? A multicenter randomized clinical trial

Version: 2 Date: 8 August 2012

Reviewer: Vikky Morris

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? - yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? - yes
3. Are the data sound? - as far as I can tell yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - yes and the authors have clearly stated the limitations of the study
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? - yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? - yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? - yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? - yes

I think this is a very well written paper and in particular the limitations are well described.

My only comment is that I have found it difficult to access some of the references that I have never seen eg 6,7, and 26.

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.

Declaration of competing interests:

I have no competing interests