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Reviewer's report:

RESEARCH QUESTION
The question of the authors concerns the factor structure of the FRAFAB questionnaire and they also tried to replicate their findings on the construct validity in a broader sample.

The research question is not new, some of the authors stated it before [7]. However, the sample in the earlier study was to small for a definite answer.

The necessity to come up with two distinct able factors hasn’t been addressed. The FRAFAB is a short 5-item questionnaire. Two questions deal with the loss of urine (amount and frequency), one question is the protection taken and two questions are on the impact of the loss of urine on daily activities and self image. All five items seem to be important clinical outcome measurement. Why do the authors want to group them?

METHODS
The method is appropriate and well described. It is described in sufficient details to replicate the work.

Although describing a Cronbach’s alpha for two items is very unusual, an ordinary correlation will do.

DATA
The data are sound and well controlled.

REPORTING
The manuscript does adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.

Several references have the status ‘submitted’.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
The discussion is very long with repeated information. More attention should be given to why we would be interested in dividing a five item instrument in two components. The components are related rather strong (r=0.31). The authors self suggest in the 5th (last sentence) and 6th paragraph of the discussion that all five elements are meaningful in itself.
TITLE AND ABSTRACT
No suggestions.

SUPPLEMENT 8: It is printed in a strange lay-out, but more important what is the meaning of this document?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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