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Reviewer's report:

This is a useful paper that facilitates the provision of condition-specific assessment for this population to achieve patient-centred, quality of life evaluation. The methodology described is sound and appropriate for questionnaire design development and evaluation in the main.

Areas for further clarification are:

- The control and patient groups have characteristic differences, namely the controls are younger and the gender distribution is not as even in the patient group. Might this have an impact on findings?

- As one third of participants are catheterised, the relevance of their questionnaire responses is unclear without further detail regarding the specific questionnaire items. As the Dutch SF-Qualiveen questionnaire contains only 8 items it would be achievable to detail the nature of the questionnaire items. - In addition, the UDI-6 particularly enquires about symptoms that may be irrelevant to catheterised patients. It is understood that this is a proxy measure as an appropriate gold standard does not exist but a lot of the questions may be inappropriate in a third of the study population. Is this a concern?

- The content validity evaluation is a cognitive debriefing process rather than a concept elicitation process which may have provided different results in terms of comprehensiveness of the questionnaire. Given that interviewees were questioned having viewed the questionnaire, the exploratory phase is not as open as would have been achieved through a concept elicitation study. These are not barriers to publication but could enhance the paper for the reader.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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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