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Reviewer's report:

General remarks:
The question posed by the author is an interesting one and worths researching.
A qualitative method is indeed the most appropriate one.
The methodology is well described, the data deposition is relevant with interesting and explanatory quotations from participants' interviews.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None apart from the required language editing - following are some exemples.

1- Overall English editing is needed before publication, and some professional terms should be translated to generally accepted standard ones (such as "the lack of perceived needs", "staff medical benefits"...).
2 - The term "to motivate the doctor shopping behavior" that appears several times could be replaced by "to generate" or "to induce".
3 - Lack of perceived needs:
This statement is not clear: the issue is the lack of continuity of care, or the lack of comprehensive care. Maybe: "perception (or attitude) towards..." or maybe "lack of expectations of ...."
4 - Staff medical benefits:
Maybe "work-provided medical insurance or care" would be better understood.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1 - The results report includes some author’s explanations and comments between the quotations, that are repetitive and make the reading a little lengthy and tedious.
2 - Author's interpretations should rather be included in the discussion part.
3 - There are some repetitions in both the results and the discussion parts.

Discretionary Revisions:

I- Concerning the research question:
Some clarification is needed with the following sentence: (p. 6/29):
"They performed doctor shopping when they sought medical treatment aside of the bladder conditions"

Was doctor shopping performed only if there were other medical conditions? Then the focus is not on OAB, and this leads to some confusion about the main research question.

II - Concerning the methodology. There should be answers in the text, to the following questions:

1 - It is notified that written explanatory sheets and consent forms were provided in participants' mother tongue. Were the participants talking in different dialects? If so, were the interviews also conducted in different languages or dialects?

2 - There is notification of a preset of questions guiding the interview: quoting them would add validity to the report of the interviewing process.

3 - Who has conducted the interviews? Is he the main researcher and author, JYS?

In that case the benefit of consistency and quality should be weighed in the discussion part, against the possible bias of subjectivity. The discussion should refer to the limitation of having the researcher and the writer be also the interviewer, as opposed to appointing some outsider person as an interviewer.

4 - Were other researchers involved with the work on the interviews transcripts and the data analysis (the coding and classification of emerging themes etc…)? Cross analysis by 2-3 researchers adds validity and reliability to the work and should be specified. This issue too should be considered in the discussion and the limitations of this research.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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