Author’s response to reviews

Title: Patient Portal Messaging for Care Coordination: A Qualitative Study of Perspectives of Experienced Users with Chronic Conditions

Authors:

JENNIFER HEFNER (Jennifer.Hefner@osumc.edu)
Sarah MacEwan (sarah.macewan@osumc.edu)
Cynthia Sieck (cynthia.sieck@osumc.edu)
Alison Biltz (alison.biltz@osumc.edu)

Version: 2 Date: 06 Mar 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to reviewers requiring further information

1- Recruitment of participants is still not clear. Please provide more context regarding the PFAC meetings and in particular the membership of this group (keep in mind you are writing for an international audience who will not be familiar with local organisation of the AMC).

This detail has been added to the study recruitment and sample section.

In addition, please clarify which author was the Principal Investigator who undertook recruitment.

Also added to the recruitment section.

2- Please add information regarding member checking as part of your 'credibility' checking as suggested by Guba and Lincoln. This information can be placed in the section on Data Analysis.

We have detailed our member-checking process in the Data Analysis section.

Further information requested by editor

3- Please add a section in your methods to describe the procedures you followed for data collection. Please include the method you followed for the focus groups (e.g. the approach of Kreuger 2002 was followed...) in particular including information about the length of time
each group ran for, the setting it occurred within, who was involved eg. a moderator + note taker), who these people were and their relationship to the participants. whether participants were paid for their time.

We are looking for evidence of data quality here - is the information collected in the focus group trustworthy? Currently this is unknown as it is missing from your manuscript.

Thank you for noting is omission. We did follow the Kreuger methodology as we now describe in the methods section.

4- Similarly with your description of how data was analysed. There is a level of detail that is missing that is needed to provide credibility to your findings. For example, who undertook the transcription of the audio files? Who led the coding of the data - is this person experienced in qualitative coding? Are they knowledgeable about the issues that were being discussed?

This detail has also been added to the analysis section.