Reviewer’s report

Title: Development of the Patient’s Experience and Attitude Colposcopy Eindhoven Questionnaire (PEACE-q)

Version: 0 Date: 15 Apr 2019

Reviewer: Katherine Jones

Reviewer's report:

In general, this paper reports an appropriate method for developing a patient satisfaction questionnaire in response to a change in the demand for an invasive preventive procedure—colposcopy. The use of focus groups to generate items grounded in the lived experience of the patients, factor analysis, and concurrent validation with an existing instrument are strengths of the methods. The resulting questionnaire is short, easily understood, and should be easy to administer in the outpatient setting.

This paper has some moderate and minor weaknesses that should be addressed. There are two moderate weaknesses. First, the rationale for development of the questionnaire is poorly developed. In the introduction, please provide additional information for readers unfamiliar with Dutch health policy. Specifically, the first sentence (p. 6, lines 2-7) states that "Due to primary high-risk Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) detection in the national cervical screening program in the Netherlands, the number of colposcopy referrals has increased by 90%(1)." I assume this sentence means that there is a relatively high prevalence of HPV in Dutch women. If so, please describe the prevalence of HPV and provide the range of increase for colposcopy referrals. For example, has the number of referrals increased from 300,000 to 570,000 or 3,000,000 to 5,700,000? Finally, please provide a stronger link between patient satisfaction and compliance/continuity of care to provide a strong rationale for developing, administering, and tracking the outcomes of an instrument that measures patient satisfaction with colposcopy. That is, if patients are poorly satisfied with the procedure are they less likely to follow-up regarding negative results and less likely to continue with future screenings?

Second, please be more specific regarding the clinical implications of the positive association between satisfaction with colposcopy and age and education. According to your results, women who are younger and have less education are at higher risk of being less satisfied with colposcopy than older, more educated women. So, what specific steps should clinicians take to increase the likelihood that younger, less educated women are just as satisfied as older, more educated women with the procedure? And provide references for these recommendations (e.g. best practices in preparing for an invasive procedure, best practices in delivering bad news).
Minor weaknesses include the following:

1. Acknowledge that conducting one focus group with five participants to generate the initial items is a limitation.

2. Clarify whether the ethical review board approval applied to the focus group as well as the questionnaire development.

3. Spell out first use of the PEACE-q in the body of the paper. The acronym is first used on p. 8 of the body of the paper without the preceding full text.

4. Be consistent about terms… sometimes the instrument is referred to as PEACE-q and sometimes as PEACE and sometimes as PEACE-8.

5. Have a person for whom English is their first language proof read the paper for awkward construction and poor word choice. For example, p. 8, line 31, "explorative" is a poor choice.

6. The numbers of the tables are not consistent with the numbers used in the text. Specifically, there are multiple Table 1's.

7. Table column headings for tables 2a (I believe it should be) and 2b are missing for the two columns under Eigenvalue (should be the two subscales?).
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