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**Reviewer's report:**

A well written and thoroughly planned feasibility study looking into an area of importance in this patient population. The methodology is sound and the study design appropriate for the research question. The proposed significant effect size of 0.5 seems reasonable and the outcome measures are both pragmatic and appropriate. My only comment would be that I think the presence/absence of an indwelling catheter (suprapubic or urethral) should be documented in the baseline information and a sub-analysis performed in this group as the incidence of UTI could be significantly different. If the incidence is not found to be different then this would also be useful information.
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