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Reviewer's report:

The authors did a good job in responding to my previous comments. And I would like to make some further comments to improve this manuscript before publication.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1) The last paragraph of introduction needs to be revised. The author did not mention they would explore the associational factors of the medication use.

2) The second paragraph of the discussion section mentioned some failures of large epidemiological studies to detect the association between certain medications and urinary symptoms, and also discussed some possible reasons; however at the next paragraph, the authors still recommended observational population-based cohort studies. It is necessary to add more justifications for such a claim.

3) The study represents an attempt to address the association between certain medication and urinary symptoms from a clinical cohort, the method of which is different from the “large epidemiological studies”. To me, this is unique contribution of this paper. However the authors did not mention and highlight it in discussion. Therefore, statements such as “Another explanation lies in the fact that well-functioning elderly individuals who participate in population-based surveys are poorly representative of the clinical cohort of geriatric patients seeking care for urinary symptoms” seem a bit off the right track.

4) One interesting point of the current paper is that the association between certain medication and urinary symptoms suggested by clinical trials and case-control study could not be confirmed at the observational studies. I do like to see more discussion on the issue from a methodological perspective.

- Minor Essential Revisions

Section of “statistical analysis”, the second last sentence, “co morbidity” needs a hyphen.

I suggest the authors use the “associational factors” instead of “predictor” in the text because this study is based on cross-sectional data.

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests