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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript investigated the prevalence and factors associated with urinary incontinence in community dwelling adult women.

Some suggestions/questions follow:

1. General issue to note#The manuscript does not bring a new fact, but contributes to previous published data. However, this manuscript did not well presented and some topics are not clearly exposed. Please reformulate and consider asking for help with writing the manuscript, as grammatical errors make understanding difficult.

2. In Method section, the statistical analysis should be specifically noted, such as multiple logistical (or linear) regression analysis. A statistically significant p-value should also be noted.

3. The sections of Results and Tables should be re-written. First, statistical analyses should correctly conduct and adequately present in table 1, 2 and 4. Because this article was to assess the factors associated with UI, the authors should present the proportion (prevalence) of UI in the associated antecedents (such as age, body mass index, and so on), stead of the proportion of these antecedents in women with/without UI did. Second, the authors described only tables in results. This lack of a clear organization has made the paper confusing. This is important, a clear organization of paper permits a better comprehension and supports the discussion and conclusions. Third, the same numbers of participants in agree or disagree about attitudes towards UI in table 3 should be corrected. Furthermore, the specific statistical analysis should be cited in all tables. In table 5, the wrong statistic method was used. Because the UI was a categorical variable, the suitable statistic method would be the multiple logistical regression, not the multiple linear regression (for dependent variable as continuous variable).

4. In the section of discussion, the authors should give some time to discuss findings from UI symptom Severity (table 4). Some limitation about the disadvantages in using questionnaire, the convenient sampling and using the definition of UI (the positive response of the item “do you have urinary incontinence” also should be noted.

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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