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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is a very well written and detailed study of women seeking primary care in a variety of settings and their knowledge of and understanding of Pelvic Floor Disorders. The study was a reasonable size and standardised questionnaires were used. The authors have tried to focus on a group who are not specifically seeking care for PFD's and assessing their knowledge. The depth of statistical analysis is very impressive. The conclusions and recommendations are sound. I like the recommendations (P13 Lines 9-29)

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
The main issue with this paper is it lacks a detailed discussion about bias. There is a discussion about ethnic groups but I think there should be a further discussion about the weaknesses of the trial in terms of enrollment. Approaching a random sample of people or asking people to pick up a form is likely to exclude a whole raft of patients and that may lead to bias. Although the response rate is briefly touched on (P7 Line 52) I think the authors should provide a little more commentary on this.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
Reading this as a clinician, I was a bit overwhelmed by the statistical analysis techniques. This is not a criticism but perhaps the stats could be discussed separately and from the outcomes. (Page 9 Lines 10-59 is a good example of the issue)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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