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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved again and I am very satisfied with the answers on my questions. I have only a few minor suggestions left.

Background

Page 2. Line 10-11 Please make clear whether this is the prevalence in the whole population or within the group of women who reported to have urinary incontinence.

Discussion

Page 14 line 16-18. "increasing age is a significant predictor for success": can be better formulated as: "the probability of a successful outcome increases with age".

Page 14 line 57-59 through Page 15 line 1-6.

I am not yet completely happy with the following paragraph:

"Trust in E-health could increase with education that addresses both the GPs' misperceptions in regular care for SUI, and the existing evidence on potential future E-health therapy".

The GPs may be right in finding the evidence not yet convincing enough: we should be cautious in interpreting the evidence on the effectiveness of E-Health in incontinence, given the paucity of studies in the field. And in my opinion the word misperceptions is misplaced in this context.

References.

Reference 2: Abrams (2010) etc.

In the meantime the 6th Edition of the International Consultation of Incontinence has been released (2017). Please can you update this reference?
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