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OPTIMAL, an Occupational Therapy Led Self-management Support Programme for People with Multimorbidity in Primary Care: A Randomized Controlled Trial

20 February 2015

Dear Dr Richards,

Thank you for the feedback on the re-submitted article and for the comments. The few minor revisions have been addressed. We have provided a description of the revisions made below as well as uploading a track change version of the original document.

Yours sincerely,

Prof Susan M Smith
On behalf of co-authors

Author responses to peer review comments.
15 February 2015

Editor’s comment:

Line 55: (Adjusted MD at follow up 4.22 (95% CI 1.59-6.85). Please remove the superfluous bracket in front of 95%.
Author Response
This superfluous bracket has been removed.

Lines 98-127: insufficient line spacing of the text. Please amend text line spacing.
Author Response
The text line spacing has been amended

Line 116: remove '(add ref)' from text.
Author Response
Apologies for this type, the ‘(add ref)’ has been removed from the text.

Lines 243-244 '10-12 patients per group as we anticipated some variation in group attendance over the programme anticipated' Remove one of the two 'anticipated' in this sentence.
Author Response
One of the two ‘anticipated’ has been removed.

Lines 272-274: the font is inconsistent with previous text and should be amended.
Author Response
The font has been amended
Also, unlike your response to reviewers, you state 'Each p-value was adjusted by multiplying it by the number of tests being run, and hence, a p-value <0.05 was still deemed significant.' Please review the text of this section and be clear. Did you or did you not apply the Bonferonni Correction (0.05/23=0.002) when interpreting secondary outcome measure data? The data presented in the results section would also imply not as p-values of 0.02 are interpreted as significant. If you did not, please remove the text relating to the Bonferroni correction and ensure that the discussion includes a short note relating to the limitation of multiple testing in this trial.

**Author Response**

Apologies for the confusion, the Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was used in the manuscript. It can be applied in two ways:

1. Adjusting alpha: Each individual comparison is performed at the (0.05/n) level of significance, where n is the number of comparisons. For example, with 23 comparisons, in order to ensure that the probability is no greater than 5% that something will appear to be statistically significant, each of individual comparisons is performed at the 0.002 (=0.05/23) level of significance. For example, a p-value of 0.03 was significant at 0.05 level but is not significant at 0.002.

2. Adjusting the p-values: An equivalent procedure is to multiply the unadjusted p-values by the number of comparisons and compare the results to the nominal significance level. That is, comparing the p-values to 0.05/n, where n is the number of comparisons, is equivalent to comparing n*p-values to 0.05. Here the p-value from above of 0.03 is multiplied by 23 to give 0.069. Comparing this to 0.05 there is no statistical significance - same conclusion as above.

In our manuscript we used method 2 above. That is, we multiplied all the unadjusted p-values by 23 and compared these adjusted p-values to 0.05. We have specifically stated this in the methods section for clarity. This method is applied very easily manually but many statistical packages also do this automatically, for example SPSS (http://www-01.ibm.com/support/docview.wss?uid=swg21476685) and R (https://stat.ethz.ch/R-manual/R-patched/library/stats/html/p.adjust.html).

**Line 427:** can you replace < six and put into words (i.e. less than or equal to six)

*Author Response*

The < six has been replaced with ‘six or less’.

**Lines 423-437.** The reference for '43' is in a different format to the remaining references in the text. I believe it to be wrong and not incorporated properly into the wider reference list. Can you review this reference, replacing with the correct source if appropriate, before reformatting in the correct journal style please?

*Author Response*

The reference for 43 has been amended accordingly and the format has been changed to the correct journal style.

**Line 459:** 'This study has provided evidence that OPTIMAL'. Can you change this
statement to ‘preliminary evidence’ - to be consistent with the feasibility/trial design?

Author Response
‘Preliminary’ has been added to this sentence.