

Review of: "A Study to Assess the Effect of Pelvic Floor Muscle Strengthening Exercises on Urinary Incontinence in Patients with Cervical Cancer Undergoing Radiation Therapy at a Tertiary Cancer Centre"

Fabício Azevedo Voltarelli¹

¹ Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

General comments: The subject of the paper is extremely relevant and the discussion on the effects of physical exercise on physiological functions in cancer patients is huge necessary. Clinically, the study results are strong and applicable, even if it is to a specific type of cancer and a specific condition as a result of radiotherapy treatment (i.e., urinary incontinence);

I suggest including the average age of the patients in the abstract(**page 1**);

The authors attributed an acronym to pelvic floor (PF), but in several places in the text they did not use it, **suggest using it whenever necessary (example: page 3, line 5). The same problem happens with the term urinary incontinence (UI) (check the entire text carefully);**

The rationale to justify the application of physical exercise to strengthen the PF is excellent. Congratulations to the authors;

Page 3, Materials and Methods: "A total of **45 samples** were selected based on the selection criteria using the non-convenience sampling technique." **It is not elegant to call patients "samples". I suggest changing it to "45 patients";**

The physical exercise intervention protocol is very interesting and seems effective and safe for patients. Furthermore, the method used to measure the strength of the perineum muscle, for example, is very sensitive to responses to specific training for the PF;

The analysis of the risks associated with the behavior and its association with urinary incontinence were superficial in the discussion of the work. **I suggest that authors delve a little deeper into this issue in order to resolve possible erroneous outcomes;**

I suggest **completely deleting the first paragraph of the Discussion**, as it is repeated information and does not add quality to this very important session. **My suggestion is that the first paragraph contains a summary of the main findings of the work, and what are the main related outcomes;**

Even though the authors reported some problems regarding adherence to training due to the pandemic period, **the 80%**

rate of task completion is quite satisfactory and guarantees the reliability of the data;

Final comments: After a thorough review of the work, I believe that the article has the minimum conditions to be published, as long as the notes made by me are resolved. The great strength of this article is the clinical application, since it is known that patients with this type of cancer suffer with UI and that if they train they can improve several parameters that will culminate in optimizing their quality of life, which is fundamental.

Congratulations to the authors.