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1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Comment 1: The research problem posed is not new in the context of Urinary health problem, however in the context of health care seeking behavior in the context of Sri Lanka, this study is relevant for strategic health promotion program. Therefore the study problem is relevant in the Sri Lanka context.

Comment 2

Page 3 line 73 delete this is redundant

Background

Comment 3

Page 3, line 77-79 add reference

Comment 4:
Add : review literature related to pelvic organ prolapse to include risk factor of SUI

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Comment 5:

Comment 5.1

Page 6 line 150-155

How author decided 400 study participants, please elaborate and what was the sampling frame, please describe

Comment 5.2.

Page 6 line 159-160

Make clear whether gynecological exam done or not done to exclude pelvic organ prolapse

Comment 6:
Please move to discussion, this is not your result, this seems your literature review result

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Comment 7. For this it would be better if commented by expert from statistics background

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Comment 8: Take comment from statistician

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Comment 9

Page 8 line 215
replace word high by within the range of
Comment 10

Page 9 line 234 : replace word subjects by study participants
Comment 11: Result and discussion are well balanced however arguments and result of this study mentioned in discussion mostly found to be not very new findings. Author should explain what new result explored from this study in the context of south east region and Shrilanka cultural context and accessibility and availability of service as well.

Comment 12
Page 10, line 261
move to limitation of study

Comment 13

add limitation of study at the end of Discussion

Comment 14 Conclusion

Page 11, line 272-73:
Rephrase according to result ,

Comment 15
Page 11 line 281-285
Be precise according to the result of this study and be specific to recommendation of prevention and care of SUI in given socio cultural context.

Comment 16:
Page 11 line 279-280
move to last para of Discussion : recommendation of further study from conclusion

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Comment 11; Abstract : it is well covered

7. Is the writing acceptable?
It would be acceptable after revision in specific minor comments
- Major Compulsory Revisions
  not much except stat review according to stat expert
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  1. Edit background
  2. Clarify sampling process and frame
  3. Respond the specific comments in result, discussion and conclusion section

Advice for publication
After reviewing the response on these comments we can decide for publication

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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