

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gpm-23-34>

Review Comments

Title: I find it too long and confusing. I recommend shortening it.

- We have altered the title, as requested.

Lines 43-44: Terminology for PFD has changed recently. Please adjust to the new recommendations. (Frawley H, Shelly B, Morin M, et al. An International Continence Society (ICS) report on the terminology for pelvic floor muscle assessment. *Neurourol Urodyn.* 2021;40(5):1217-1260)

- We have altered the terminology throughout, as requested.

-Lines 57-59: Why can those conditions interfere? Please, specify.

- Psychological comorbidities can have multiple effects, but, with a mind not to write a vast amount that is not strictly relevant for the current purposes, we have given an example of how depression can reduce motivation and behavioural activities, and interfere with appointment attendance.

-Lines 66-67: Which psychological conditions? Please, clarify.

- This has been clarified.

-Line 136: I suppose “SES” stands for “socioeconomic status”. Please write it down as it is the first time it appears on the manuscript.

- This has been written out the first time it appears.

Participants: it would be nice to add a table with the characteristics of the participants to facilitate the reading of the article.

➤ Thank you for the suggestion, but we have not done this, as we feel that a table would not really add any further information that is not included in the text, and may break up the ease of reading the paper.

-Methods: One of the major shortcomings of the article is the lack of a data analysis section. Please add a paragraph specifying the statistics used and adding effect sizes.

➤ We have included a data analysis section, as requested.

-Line 168: For the WIMD add a reference please.

➤ We have added the weblink to the Welsh Government site for MIMD.

-Line 175: How reliable is “time and date” webpage to base the results of the investigation on it? If not so reliable, please add this to limitations of the study.

➤ We have noted that the data on the weather site are regarded as accurate, but have also made comment on the potential issues with precision of measurement for particular locations within an area in the limitations.

-Lines 181-182: there is a large difference in the number of cases between public and private appointments, so statistical power may vary. Add it to limitations, please.

➤ We have included this as a limitation in the Discussion.

-Line 198 (temperature section): it is not clear what is considered to be lower or higher temperatures.

➤ We have altered the wording so as to be clear this is a correlational analysis, and there is no particular cut-off for lower or higher temperatures.

-Lines 223-226: Correlation does not imply causation. I think you are making some very strong statements in this regard and cannot say that the no attendance to the appointments is due to temperature.

➤ We have altered the wording to reflect the correlational nature of the associations that were found.

-Lines 248-249: Same. It seems to me that some behaviors are being assumed and cannot be confirmed.

➤ We have altered the language so as it reflect the speculative nature of this suggestion.

-Line 272: please add the limitations mentioned before.

➤ These have been added, as requested.