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Reviewer’s report:

Initially I thank you for the opportunity to review this article.

Qualitative research has been gaining ground among scientific articles, however its method and analysis of results need the same or greater rigor of quantitative studies.

Title:

I suggest change to:

"Women's experiences of receiving care for pelvic organ prolapse. A qualitative study."

There is a lot of information in the title. The "experience of women" already reflects the current concept of "person-centered care". In my opinion the study design gets better at the end of title.

Abstract:

Please include "an intentional sample of 22 w…." in methods.

I suggest that in the results or discussion the importance of the multi-professional team in approaching treatment options should be addressed.

K-words: I suggest change "patient experience" for "woman experience"

Exclude "health care delivery", change "patient choice" for "woman choice".

Introduction:

too long

I suggest to exclude
"In the reality of clinical practice, decisions are also likely to be influenced by practitioner skills, preferences and knowledge as well as availability and access to treatments."

"A detailed understanding of women's experiences of interactions with different health professionals and health services throughout their prolapse care is essential to improve the person centered ness of services."

"Within PROPEL, the local sites were provided …to prove insightful for designing women's health services internationally."

Methods

Sample: Please include that is an intentional sample

Data Collection: KS and SW (one lead facilitator who was experienced in qualitative methodology and conducting focus groups, and one support facilitator who had knowledge in the subject area) - please include the academic background and profession of KS and SW.

Was informed consent obtained for each woman participant? If yes, include in method.

It is necessary to talk about the theoretical reference used before the software nVIVO

Results

Please change "Findings" for "Results"

This topic is too long and tiring, needs to be reduced, there must be one or two "texts / speech" for each category or sub category. And at most two, when there is ambivalence.

The results need to be rewritten in a more concise way. This part of the article does not grab the attention of the reader, needs to be more objective, the "texts / speech" can also be shorter. And very direct answers like "exactly" do not need to be included.

Figure 2: Final coding framework for focus group/interviews - I suggest a more creative figure to show the creation of the final coding framework

Discussion

It's the best part of the paper..

But it is not "a relatively small cohort of women" but an intentional sample in a qualitative analysis.
To say that "meaning the generalisability of the findings is unclear" is to disbelieve the methodology used. This phrase needs to be rewritten.

Both in the discussion and in the conclusions it is necessary to be very clear that the health care team must be multi-professional since this is not the reality in many places.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
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