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Author's response to reviews:

Group versus individual sessions delivered by a physiotherapist for female urinary incontinence: an interview study with women attending group sessions nested within a randomised controlled trial

Response to the reviewers’ comments

1. Charis Glazener

1. Item 3 - We have checked and corrected this inconsistency.

2. Item 9 - We have clarified the women not included in the interview study in the discussion. The discussion already commented that the views of these women may be different from those interviewed.

3. Item 10 - The submitted paper did not include the text quoted in this item.

Minor essential revisions:

Item 4 ‘several’ changed to ‘A few’

2. Dudley Robinson

1. Flow chart: we felt this unnessasary

2. Difference in recruitment between centres: we have added a sentence to the method to clarify this.

3. Recall bias: this issue is already addressed in the discussion.

4. Who performed the interview: we have added this in the methods section.

5. Second paragraph of in results is repetitive: the paragraph explains the analysis and the structure of the remainder of the results section so we have left
it in place.

6. Bias in the quotes with few being negative: we actively looked for disconfirming accounts in the interviews and have added a sentence to the methods section to clarify this. As is usual in qualitative study reporting, the quotes represent the range of views expressed and the range of women included.

7. Bias as women who refused to join are excluded: the discussion already commented that the views of these women may be different from those interviewed.

8. Can conclude little about ethnic diversity: agree (and we don’t attempt to do so)