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Introduction

1. Line 50: Should this be "87.4% sensitivity"?

Methods

2. Lines 21-23: It would likely be useful to the reader to mention here why women with a chief complaint of prolapse were excluded.

3. Lines 26-27: How were the controls specifically identified? For example, were they the next consecutive patient without prolapse?

4. Line 53: "Rations" should be "ratios."

5. Line 54: "Receiver operating curve (ROC)" should be "receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve."

Discussion

6. Lines 20-26: It would be helpful to the reader to describe the reasons why these results differ.

7. Lines 35-40: As discussed in prior comment #9, these sentences should be reworded to make it clear that the higher sensitivity may be due to increased severity of POP in the Ethiopian population and not simply increased prevalence, which would not affect the sensitivity and specificity of the test.

8. Lines 56-58: "The POPSSI can predict POP in approximately 90%" would be better worded as "the POPSSI can detect POP in 90% of affected patients."

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

Yes

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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.