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Faculty of Medicine,  
P O Box 271  
University of Colombo,  
Sri Lanka.

03.06.2014

Dr Iliana Lega  
Executive Editor,  
BioMed Central Womens Health Journal.

Dear Dr Lega,

**RE: “Descriptive cross sectional study on prevalence, perceptions, predisposing factors and health seeking behaviour of women with stress urinary incontinence(SUI)”**

Thank you for the editorial comments. I have been able to address them all and now the manuscript is clear and reads better. The details of revisions are described below.

I am pleased to submit the revised manuscript with this letter listing my responses and corrections to the comments made by the editor.

Please let me know if any further clarifications are required.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Jennifer Perera  
Corresponding author
Responses to Editor’s Comments:

Comment 1:
Table 3,4 The heading should be changed from significance to p value. P values listed as 0.000 should be changed to <0.001.

**Headings of Tables 3 and 4 were changed from significance to p value and relevant p values were corrected as <0.001.**

Comment 2:
The description of the analysis in the methods section needs to be expanded. This can be done mostly by moving sentences on ln 196-200, pg 8 to the methods section. It is important to state that both univariate and multivariate analyses were conducted, and to list which variables were included in the multivariate analysis and why they were included.

**All the required information regarding multivariate and univariate analysis were included in lines 159-161 in page 6 and lines 194-201 in page 8. Reasons for including the specific variables in the regression model have been explained.**

Comment 3:
Table 4 needs to include the variables adjusted for in the multivariate analysis. This can be done by adding them in a foot note at the bottom of the table.

**Foot note was added in lines 500-502 in page 21 to indicate the variables adjusted for in the multivariate analysis.**

Comment 4:
Figure 1 is busy. Instead of labeling each bar with the %, the authors should put the actual number of subjects which fall into each category. The actual % can be derived from the graph and does not need to be listed in the figure.

**The actual number of subjects which fall into each category is given in the figure 1.**

Comment 5:
The introduction could be further condensed, it is still too long. I suggest that the paragraph comprising ln 100-106 on pg 4 be shortened to one sentence, that is then combined into the paragraph that follows (ie. ln 108-113).

**The paragraph was shortened to lines 99-100 in page 4.**