

# 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"

Letícia Ferreira

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this research. First, I would like to congratulate you on the topic, which is very important and of great need for healthcare professionals and patients.

Here are some considerations:

- ABSTRACT: When considering that there is more than one type of incontinence, it would be important to describe which ones will be found in the research. Include that pre-exercise perineometry was also performed. I suggest adapting the keywords according to the descriptors: uterine cervical neoplasms and pelvic floor. The results were well described.
- INTRODUCTION: Good description and contextualization, review parts that are duplicated and it is important to include the objectives in the last paragraph.
- MATERIALS AND METHODS: Include details of ethics approval and it was not clear whether the patients signed the ICF, which is important to describe. For the inclusion criteria, should the patient not present urinary symptoms? For the exclusion criteria, shouldn't patients who have previously performed pelvic floor exercises be excluded? I suggest removing the mean pressure data from parity-related perineometry.
- INTERVENTION: Very well described and great images. I suggest adding the justification for the proposed protocol, mainly in relation to the frequency and types of proposed exercises and the use of gluteal, adductor and abdominal muscles. Include a description of how the daily exercise was performed.
- DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION: All tables require captions. In table II, it is important to include the data measurement unit. I suggest removing tables VI, VIIA/B because they are tables that are not related to the objective of the research and because they contain data in which the criteria for diagnosis are different. I also believe that it is possible to improve the description of table VII.
- DISCUSSION: Review the information regarding daily monitoring, in the methods it is described that it was carried out for 8 weeks and in the discussion for 12 weeks. I missed going deeper into the discussion, a lot of information was repeated from what had been exposed in the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Congratulations on the research carried out

