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**Reviewer's report:**

Although the authors try to study surgical IC-related problems, this work includes several problems. Overall, since study background is not succinctly summarized, it is difficult to understand the research background and evaluate what findings are unique and new. To improve the quality of the manuscript, I think the following points need to be addressed.

1. Literature review seems to be incomplete. For example, authors say that "Empirical research based on patient perception of IC is scant [7]" (p4, line 48), I want to know findings in the neighboring field such as patient-physician communication.

2. In addition, the authors need to identify regional boundaries where the patient IC-related problem is raised. You are talking about the problem in Israel or in other countries?

3. Only 12 Israeli patients recruited by snowballing were studied. Why did you decided 12 patients? Please justify the sample size (n=12). Why snowballing was adopted as a sampling strategy?

4. Please clearly state the external validity of the present finding. Is the finding is applicable to other patients experiencing surgery in Israel? Is the study finding is applicable to patients in other countries, such as European countries, US or Canada? If so, why? If not applicable, why?

5. Please explain the reason why patients with minor diseases were not studied?

6. If you want to elucidate valid findings based on this qualitative methodology, how many more patients are necessary?

7. We want to know what new material the authors are trying to report in addition to the previous findings.
(8) In the conclusion of the Abstract, a model for patient-centered surgical informed consent process was proposed. However, this model was not derived from the qualitative analysis. Conclusion would be "an infringement of a patient's right to respect for autonomy". The model should be presented in the discussion on the basis of the results.

**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.

No

**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

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

Acceptable
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