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Author’s response to reviews:

March 16, 2020

Dr. Paul Wilson
Editor-in-Chief, Implementation Science

Re: Understanding the public’s role in reducing low-value care: a scoping review (IMPS-D-19-00616)

Dear Dr. Wilson:

Thank you for the suggestion to incorporate the recent commentary by Norton and Chambers into our manuscript. Our response to this suggestion is outlined below. The additions appear highlighted in yellow within the revised mark-up manuscript.

We hope you find these changes acceptable and look forward to your response.

Yours truly,

Daniel J. Niven
MD, MSc, PhD, FRCPC
Editor’s Requests

1. Citation addition: Your conclusion rightly flags the need to further understand the public’s role in initiatives to reduce low-value care. We have just published a commentary on opportunities to advance research on de-implementation which highlights patient level questions. We don't normally ask authors to do this, but in this instance it would be good to link the two as each reinforces the other. (Norton, W.E., Chambers, D.A. Unpacking the complexities of de-implementing inappropriate health interventions. Implementation Sci 15, 2 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-019-0960-9)

Response: We speak specifically to the commentary within the following additions to the Discussion section of the manuscript:

“Given the breadth of the literature examined, the importance of public inclusion as stakeholders in de-implementation initiatives [15], and resources dedicated to reducing low-value care [22], the findings of this study have implications for current and future initiatives that seek to reduce low-value care.” (lines 292-293)

“Embracing shared decision-making as a strategy for reducing low-value care will require appropriate infrastructure within the healthcare system and cultural shift among patients and clinicians, however, as highlighted in a recent commentary on the complexities of de-implementation[15], taking such measures to address patient-level factors that affect de-implementation will be key to the success of future de-implementation initiatives.” (lines 316-318)

In addition, we have referenced the commentary in both the Introduction and Discussion sections, as follows:

“Members of the public (e.g., patients, caregivers, citizens) have been identified as important stakeholders within initiatives to reduce low-value care[1,14,15].” (line 82-83)

“How patients and the public are optimally involved in initiatives to reduce low-value care has been highlighted as a deficiency in the science that underpins reducing low-value care[15,20].” (lines 95-96)

“Given that patient demand is a frequently cited barrier to reducing low-value care [15,37–39], tools that inform patients and their caregivers at the point-of-care about the lack of utility of certain tests or treatments are promising.” (lines 298-300)