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Reviewer's report:

The authors have extensively addressed the questions raised during the first review round. They decided to include an interrupted time series analysis on new endpoints (number of new diagnosis and number of newly diagnosed patients treated with medication from the cohort of the whole JMDC (during a limited period of time), as suggested.

I still do have a number of questions, mainly related to the methodology and the conclusions drawn:

* The authors justify the delay they see in the effect of the original analysis by explaining that the average interval of clinic visits is 3 months for overactive bladder patients. However, one would assume that patients are evenly distributed over these intervals around time of the intervention. Indeed some patients may just have visited the physician before the intervention and any effect on their treatment will indeed take 3 months. But other patients are at the end of their 3-months interval and will visit the physician the day after the event. So I still have difficulties to really understand what causes the delay and therefore be sure that what we see is an effect of the intervention.

* Similarly: I do not understand why the authors used various interrupted time points. The choice to also present P4 as time of the event seems to be data driven, not driven by the point in time of the intervention.

* Page 8, line 17: N=30 is unclear. 30 what? Similarly, what does N=25 mean on page 9, line 25.

* Fig 2a +b: There seems to be a strange outlier in both graphs around P5 in year 1. Any idea why? How does this influence the results?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

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.
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.
I recommend additional statistical review

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 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

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript?

Add a record of this review to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world’s journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

No