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Reviewer’s report:

The MOTHERFIT 1 & MOTHERFIT 2 trial protocols are suitable for publication in trials.

I think this protocol can be accepted in its current format. I make some suggestions below which could be incorporated.

I am not a content expert in this area but I do not think the protocol requires further peer review, the need for the 2 trials supported with appropriate evidence and justified well.

The trial design is appropriate to answer the research questions, and the authors indicate (and attach to evidence) that the protocol already has funding and ethical approvals, demonstrating prior peer review.

The primary outcome and cost effectiveness outcomes and associated outcome measurement instruments are logical choices for the assessment of incontinence (an incontinence specific function and QoL tool) and cost-effectiveness (EQ5D). The authors could clarify in discussion whether there is a core outcome set for the condition/the population (I don't think there is yet) to further justify their choices.

The other secondary outcomes (patient reported improvement, another UI specific QOL tool, a training diary, and another study specific 'patient satisfaction' questionnaire) could be regarded as requiring excessive demands on participants' time. Perhaps these could be justified further in the discussion - for example, do you know how much time it takes to complete each one? Or do you have an estimate of how much time each participant will spend on a weekly basis filling out questionnaires?

All requested documentation and reporting guidance is supplied.

Good luck with your trial.
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