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Reviewer's report:

I think the manuscript can be published without further revisions but since this is an open peer review system and the author's responses are posted on your website, then the website record needs to reflect that their responses to my criticisms mischaracterize the previous RCT's on this topic.

1. In their response to criticism 1, they are mischaracterizing the previous RCT's on this topic as not including stress predominant mixed incontinence subjects in the study populations and this is not true. ValUE inclusion criteria had mixed incontinence subjects in the trial as long as it was stress predominant (MESA score was higher for stress than urge). VUSIS- 2 subjects had symptoms of pure SUI or mixed urinary incontinence (UI) with predominant stress incontinence. So it is not appropriate to imply that the INVESTIGATE patient population is significantly different than the previous RCT studies. This INVESTIGATE population is also uncomplicated- they have no prolapse, no previous surgery, no neurological disease. I don't think the authors have a good answer to question 1 and I can accept that, but the comparable RCT studies should not be misrepresented.
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