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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this paper. Overall the paper is well written, worthy of publication and I feel would be much better suited to the IUGA journal, BJOG or Neurourology and Urodynamics.

As we discussed on the phone I do have a personal issue with on line journals charging authors to publish their work and particularly when reviewers are unpaid and often under very short deadlines.

Noe the less I do think this is a good paper and would encourage the authors to submit in a paper journal (for free).

I have several specific comments which I make below (all are compulsory and suggested):

I like qualitative research and find this paper interesting

2003 was a long time ago

A flow chart would be useful to see patient flow

Was the difference in recruitment between centres based on social class, ethnicity, geography or other reasons?

Questions 3-4 months later were too long and there will be considerable recall bias. This is a major limitation

Who performed the interviews. If it was the physio there would be considerable bias as they would want to please her with favourable reports and comments.

Second paragraph in results is repetitive and should be deleted

I like the quotes - a strong point of the study

There is a bit of bias in the quotes with very few being negative

Bias again is introduced as those women who refused to join are excluded from the analysis - hence the results will be skewed to favour group therapy

Table 3: Virtually all these women were caucasian so we can conclude little about ethnic diversity and their ideas regarding group therapy.

Otherwise I thought the paper was well written and interesting. I sure it would be considered for publication elsewhere.
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