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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the revised manuscript. you have addressed my major concerns and the paper is now much more clear. I do have a few remaining comments:

1) it is still not clear to me why you excluded women presenting with prolapse as their main concern. Was this because you wanted to use the tool to screen for women who may not present with prolapse, as a way of screening communities for women with disease? Please provide more explanation

2) data on parity should be presented as median/range not as mean/SD, and compared by Mann Whitney test. Parity is a non-continuous variable and so parametric tests are incorrect.

3) you should use the terms "anterior compartment prolapse" and "posterior compartment prolapse" rather than "cystocele" and "rectocele"

4) I think your conclusions and discussion is very non-critical of the data you present. My interpretation is that the single question about vaginal bulge has a higher sensitivity and specificity than the whole questionnaire (particularly as the other three questions have very poor test performance characteristics). Surely, a more appropriate conclusion is that there is no need for a questionnaire, but a single screening question about vaginal bulge will serve the function as a screening too well, and indeed better than this questionnaire? I think you should revise your discussion and conclusion.
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