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Prognosis of patients with apparent treatment resistant hypertension - A feasibility study

Peter Hayes; Hannah Kielty; Monica Casey; Liam Glynn; Gerard J Molloy; Hannah Durand; John Newell; Andrew Murphy

Pilot and Feasibility Studies

Summary: a well-written paper from authors who clearly have experience in pilot and practice-based studies. The quality of the paper is good and is appropriate for publication.

Abstract: The abstract covers the key areas in describing the study, without any need for corrections or changes;

Background: A succinct yet clear description of the background and need for this pilot study. No changes recommended;

Methods: The methods section covers the most salient topics and design components of this pilot study. In particular, I approve of the recruitment process, which endeavors to select patients/practices from various locations and background. The experience of the authors and the pre-tested research process comes through in the methods section, so many elements of the research process and research administration is implicit. The authors make is clear that the research process is driven and administered by research assistants, who coordinate the process. However, a paragraph on how researchers and assistants would ensure or facilitate a smooth research process would be nice, alongside how participation in the research by GP practices was "incentivized".
Results: A well-written section without any need for changes;

Discussion & Conclusion: Some good insights and challenges are cited in this section related to a definitive study. An extra paragraph on how the research process was managed and some further recommendation on facilitating a smooth research process would be nice, especially around enticing GP practices to participate and any strategies used to facilitating data collection. Practice-based research is always tough to implement and any insights or advice to researchers related to how management and incentivizing participation in research by GP practices would be valuable.

Figures and Tables: The tables are clear and the flow sheet offer a good description of patient flow in a CONSORT-like manner.
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