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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

The first revision represents an improvement in the original manuscript. Thank you for addressing my comments and revising. However, I do have the following comments and I believe the manuscript must be edited again before final acceptance.

Comment 1: Thank you for addressing and striking the words "real world". Regarding the additional paragraph (now paragraph #4) added in the Discussion, the last 2 sentences of that 4th paragraph in the Discussion should be combined into 1 sentence as follows and the word "then" should be moved as follows: "Moderate improvements, as shown in the urinary questions (see tables 3 and 4), could then be perceived as important benefits from the patient's or clinician's perspective because such moderate improvements were observed in the urinary symptoms that best define the OAB condition.

Comment 2: You revised the 3rd paragraph of the Background Section such that the last added sentence reads "This dose response has not been demonstrated with all of the other antimuscarinic agents that offer multiple doses." This is incorrect and must be deleted. In my original comment I specifically stated that there were contemporary studies that did support dose escalation of solifenacin. Delete the Ellsworth reference and review the paper by Haab et al entitled "Long-term open-label solifenacin treatment associated with persistence with therapy in patients with overactive bladder syndrome" in European Urology (2005) volume 47: pages 376-384. You should incorporate language to support the fact that the dose response has been demonstrated with solifenacin and add that reference in support.

Comment 3: Thank you for adding language to describe OAB-V8, and thanks for adding the reference.

Comment 4: Thanks for adding the p value. Also, thanks for the clarification in language on treatment length.

Comment 5: Thanks for deleting the discussion on nocturia since it wasn't statistically significant.
Comment 6: Thanks for the change in language to "Summary of Study Populations".

Comment 7: This revision reads better in English. Yet, there is still some grammatical editing that must performed.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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