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Review
This paper addresses the main results of a feasibility study about the important area of treatments for women with urinary incontinence. A mixed methods approach was used with data collected via multiple methods. The paper reports the results for the multicentre randomized pilot trial and the face-to-face interviews with eligible patients. The authors give a detailed description of the undertaking of the study and the study findings and discuss the limitations and challenges in the conduct of the study. Overall it was a well-presented manuscript with relevant tables and figures to support the results. Table 1 was a very useful way of summarising the findings and evidence.

Compulsory Revisions
1. The qualitative adds an important aspect to the understanding of aspects of the conduct of this feasibility study and the results per se are interesting and relevant. The methods refer to continuing interviews until data saturation was reached but this seems inconsistent with Page 27 which indicates that that all women who were willing were interviewed. Can you please clarify. Also can you indicate how was rigor established in the qualitative data analysis phase?
2. As 29 participants were interviewed it is usual not to choose quotes from the same participants – you have used quotes from participant 04 and 17 twice can you please find appropriate quotes from other participants.

Minor Revisions
1. Abstract and methods: The paragraph describing aspects of the mixed
methods study reads as though there were multiple studies; can you consider describing it as … multicenter randomized pilot trial and; qualitative face-to-face interviews with … etc.

2. Define the abbreviations: Page 6 OAB; Page 25 PFMT.

3. Page 11: Given the inconsistency in the term study can you clarify that the ethical approval was for all aspects of the study i.e. randomized pilot and qualitative interviews?

4. Page 16: For consistency and explanation with the list of outcomes can you give a statement introducing the EQ-5D-3L instrument.

4. Table 1 needs some minor editing.

Discretionary Revisions

2. Page 21: As the sample numbers are used to indicate the women who screened positive and agreed to randomization could this information be added to table 2.

3. Can you please consider adding legends for all tables and figures which contain abbreviations.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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