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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This is a well written text of a well done experiment and the result is clinical useful.

Comments:

Sometimes rather spoken language is used which is most disturbing in what should be a "dry" result section (ie thus,… however,… word rather used in a discussion).

The main criticism could be the difference in age of control and cases, this could have been prevented. At least some discussion on the potential impact is needed in the discussion section.

Furthermore SCI rehab-patients have typically a bimodal age distribution, was this so here or not and if yes how was the control group distributed. It was smart not to take the rehab group so I would expect a rather normal distribution of age, please comment.

In general I also miss information on interval spinal lesion and assessment. Is required as this might impact quality of life significantly.

Table 1: instead of complete or incomplete, I would suggest to use the ASIA score.

I miss some reflection if the questionnaire could be used in other Dutch speaking countries among the world.

Table 1 has a lot of information that might be correlated with "validation" results, ie does the questionnaire perform as well in high or low lesions; in patients with different bladder emptying methods etc,…
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