

## Peer Review File

**Article information:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-23-1768>

### Review Comments

Dear Reviewers

Thank you for your efforts. First, we apologize for not informing the reviewers that this article belongs to a special issue, and that all the 19 contributions are Reviews written to a specific template.

#### Reviewer A

First of all, I would like to congratulate you for your efforts in the development of this research.

However, I must inform you that I do not consider it suitable for publication in this Journal due to its low methodological and formal quality.

Reply: OK.

From the title, which falls into elucubration and states facts that the authors do not have the capacity to confirm, to the methodology applied and how it has been transmitted (reduced number of methodological details provided, which limits the reproducibility of the research, which is the premise of any scientific report).

Reply: With respect, they do. This is a Review. Patricia Skilling's original data was based on 24 hour pad tests, urodynamics, 24 hour charts.

#### Reviewer B

##### Style and writing

1. I would recommend you break down your paper per protocol into "Introduction, Study, research objective, methodology, results, and then conclusion". I do not see that in your paper.

Reply: According to the journal guideline, a review article consists of Introduction, main body (including discussion), and Conclusion.

<https://atm.amegroups.org/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors#content-2-2>

2. Do you have a table for participants' characteristics (age, race, parity, menopausal status)?

Reply: Again, it is a short Review, not an original research paper.

3. I would recommend you expand on your background literature review.

##### Research design and question

4. How did you choose the two very different cohorts (women older than 25 years of age and children younger than 12 years of age)?

Reply: They are not cohorts. There are two totally different studies. The common link is both had the Skilling pelvic exercises. The bedwetting study exercises were very much modified.

5. Where did you recruit your subjects? What is the context? Is it randomized, from an outpatient center, or from a physical therapy practice?

Reply: Again, it is a short Review.

6. Did patients apply the device in the posterior fornix or had to come in an office to learn how to do it?

Reply: YES.

### **Results**

7. Your results state that most of your subjects were premenopausal women, what is the percentage? Are you able to share the demographics of your patients?

Reply: From the original paper, one hundred and forty-seven patients, mean age 52.5 years (range 25–76) and mean parity 2.25 (range 0– 5), commenced the full regime. Ten patients were nulliparous. Surgery included, the dropout rate was 47% (Table 1).

### **Conclusion**

8. Your sample size is not big enough in both women and children to conclude that Squatting-based skilling exercise is better than bed-alarm since it was not compared to it in a trial.

Reply: We agree. We have removed it from the conclusion. We prefixed the comment by saying “prima facie”. The comparator was the parents did not have to wake at night.