Reviewer’s report

Title: Women’s experiences of receiving care for pelvic organ prolapse: A qualitative study.

Version: 0 Date: 10 Dec 2018

Reviewer: Raquel Vivancos

Reviewer’s report:

The article has theoretical relevance, and its objective adds knowledge and quality to the practice of care. It is well written and clear in its methodological outline. However, some methodological aspects compromise the reliability of the study findings. The following considerations come to improve the authors' perspective on the work design.

The study does not make use of a specific theoretical-methodological reference that subsidizes the authors' discussion regarding the content analysis findings in the literature. Although this is not an obligation, it confers robustness to the study and can enrich the discussion about the data. Considering that the main objective of the study was to know the experience of these women, the Phenomenology could be the theoretical methodological reference that would better meet the proposed objective. Such consideration follows as a suggestion.

The text does not specify the criteria for inclusion or exclusion in the study.

The sociodemographic data collection of the participants was not performed. Although this has been placed as a limitation, this is an important limitation from the point of view of knowledge of the sample profile.

The losses were not justified. 39 accepted to participate in the study, but only 22 were included.

A mixed collection of data occurred by associating focus groups and telephone interviews, it is believed in the attempt not to decrease the number of participants because of the difficulty in gathering all in face-to-face focus groups. This was a major complicator of the study, as there is no homogeneity in the way the data were collected.

The use of the saturation criteria in data collection was not mentioned. Could not the number of participants be expanded? Do the authors consider the results enough to meet the objective proposed by the study?

In the results, an identified category was omitted by the authors because it was not related to the women's care experience. Such a data would need to be clarified, especially since the purpose is the experience of women and this should not be restricted to the researchers' inquiries.

In the presentation of the article, there are many authors who were not described in terms of their respective participation in the study.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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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