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Reviewer's report:

This is a comparative, sponsored, observational web-based study assessing the performances of the Bladder Symptom Screening Tool (BSST) and indentifying the cut-off point for screening multiple sclerosis OAB patients who could benefit for further neuro-urological evaluation and treatment.

The question made by the authors is pretty well defined and the manuscript sounds to be acceptable with few major revisions. In my opinion the major limit of this study, as briefly report by the authors on their discussion, was that data were not related to the clinician assessment. Another limit that might be reported it was that neither a concurrent validity, correlating results with other validated tools was performed.

Major revisions:

Patient demographic and clinical characteristics should be better defined and reported, whether they were recorded. How many patients were on bladder medications? How many patients were already seen by clinicians for OAB symptoms? Any data about comorbidities?

What do the authors mean with that disability was assessed by phone? What did they specifically assess and what no? How did the authors assess the cognitive status, whether it is was done? Otherwise, authors could better define such lack of data as possible limitation of the study.

Discretional revisions

In the introduction and discussion authors referred to Cardozo et al as the study in which was established 3 as cut-off value in urogynecological patients. While, in Cardozo’s study it’s been deduced that her group only confirmed such cut-off in their cohort which was already determined by expert clinicians in Burks et al validation study for MS population. Please, can authors check the right reference about this important issue?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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