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MacCulloch et al

This paper describes the results of two focus groups discussions on development and support of online resources for adolescents with idiopathic scoliosis. This group was composed of orthopedic health care providers and was one stakeholder group of 3. The other two were post-op AIS patients or surgical candidates and parents. All were from one institution, a large specialized children’s hospital in a major metropolitan centre.

The discussion provided suggestions and cautions for web based information.

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? - yes, orthopedic health care workers thoughts on a web based information resources for AIS
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? – yes, 2 moderated focus groups
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Many of comment given by the focus groups related to their perception of what others, the adolescents or parents, would want/need. These comments are probably correct but not as helpful as they could be if the data from the adolescents and families themselves were also provided. And without the corroboration of the other groups one can not be sure that the suggestions are valid. Although the focus groups are multi disciplinary, they are all from one major acute care centre and may not be sensitive to the needs of patients and families in more remote areas.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes but the paper would be much improved if the results of the other 2 focus groups discussion were also included.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No, the study reveled more mostly what health care providers believe adolescents and parents would want/need in a web site. The conclusions about evidence based, user-centered, etc are correct.
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? The title should reflect that the paper limits itself to the health care workers.
7. Is the writing acceptable? Writing is very good especially the introduction.

My major concern with this paper is the absence of data from the other two groups. Without those data, I am not sure what value this paper holds for the readers.

My personal editorial pet peeve is the use of “in order to” when “to” would do just fine.
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