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Reviewer's report:

This is in general a well written and adequately analyzed study.

Major comments:
The only major concern about this study, relying on a before and after surgery assessment, would be that the loss to follow-up is selective. Even though no substantial differences in QOL at base-line between participants and those lost to follow-up were found, it may be the case that women with improved QOL are more likely to participate. It can of course also be the other way around. I would like to see a more elaborate discussion on the potential for bias due to patients lost to follow-up.

When looking at the scores for the different QOL domains after 3 months they seem to be very similar to the scores of women without pelvic organ prolapse. Does this mean that surgery altered their QOL to a level that would be expected among women without POP? Could this be formally analyzed by comparing women without POP with the 3 months post-surgery scores, with suitable adjustments for confounding factors? Do the authors think that it is reasonable that the QOL is on average fully restored already after 3 months? Or could it be that patients with poor improvement of QOL have higher probability of loss to follow-up?

Minor comments:
I do not find it necessary to state the use of the GEE method in the results section it is sufficient to state this in the method section.

The last sentence in Statistical analysis: should it not be <0.05?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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