

Reviewer's report

Title: Ready for goal setting? Process evaluation of a patient-specific goal-setting method in physiotherapy

Version: 0 **Date:** 24 May 2017

Reviewer: Simone van Dulmen

Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting topic as goal setting is an important aspect of the treatment of the physiotherapist. This process evaluation is well developed and executed with physiotherapists and patients. Improving the goal setting process and client centered care is challenging and the use of an instrument as the PCS might facilitate this process. I have some comments and questions: 1. The title does in my opinion not fit with the content of the study. The aim of the study is to examine the feasibility of the PSC2.0. This instrument might facilitate the goal setting process, but the use of the PSC2.0 should be included in the title. 2. It is informative to include the PSC2.0 in an appendix. 3. Page 5 line 9: Why was an inclusion criteria 'preferably treatment of chronic patients'? And why is an inclusion criteria 'uses the (original) PSC'? 4. Page 5 line 16: Could you describe for what patient groups the PCS2.0 is suitable more in detail? And how should the PSC be used; is the questionnaire completed in a consult with the patient? Or should the first 3 steps be completed without interference of the physiotherapist? For evaluative purposes this could be relevant due to risk of socially desirable answers when the physiotherapist is involved in the scoring. As with other patient reported outcomes, it is recommended that the patient reports directly: 'A patient reported outcome (PRO) is directly reported by the patient without interpretation of the patient's response by a clinician or anyone else and pertains to the patient's health, quality of life, or functional status associated with health care or treatment'. (Higgins JPT, Greene S, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011.) 5. Page 13 line 17: what are the reasons for patients not to be involved in goal setting and treatment planning. 6. Page 13 line 18: When patients have cognitive or communication problems, is this an exclusion criteria for the use of the PSC2.0? 7. Table 4: I think there is a wrong median score and IQR score on the 'behaviour intention' in the 'after' column. (42.5) 8. Page 16 line 8: 'as regards informing patient....' Patient should be in plural. 9. Page 17 line 6: ... indicate the difficulty of performing these steps.... Is it difficult due to the PCS2.0 or is it difficult in general due to e.g. patient expectations or communication skills? What is the facilitation role of the PCS2.0 in setting goals and treatment planning? Should future research focus on extra focus on implementation and communication skills of these steps of the PCS? Or is it more in general a learning aim for physiotherapists?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

no

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report

including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world's journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

No