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Editor
BMC Series

Re: BRHM-D-19-00019R1

Patients’ Perspectives of Outcomes after Total Knee and Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Nominal Group Study

Response to reviewers

Dear Dr. Fitzpatrick,

I am returning my response to the reviewers, with the responses in arial font to facilitate the review.
Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the questions raised,

Sincerely,

Susan M Goodman, MD

The authors have addressed many points I have highlighted, but would like further clarifications on the following:

p3/line53: 'open ended patient input', can the authors pl explain this notion, pl?

Response: Our intention was to distinguish this from surveys or panels where themes are pre-selected. Since this is confusing, we have removed this phrase.

Added to the text: … Patient research partners comprise an important critical part of all OMERACT working groups. Patient panels comprising of only patients have been utilized in other settings (12). To our knowledge, in-depth qualitative studies in patients who have undergone TJR are limited.. We sought to explore patients’ priorities directly.

p4/line 33-34: I think the authors make an assumption here that during the OMERACT project patients may have not felt comfortable due to presence of academics, clinicans etc. How do the authors know how patient representative felt at the time? In my view this assumption is unhelpful.

Response: We agree, it is not possible to know. See revised text as in the response to the comment right above.

p4/line 45: pl grammatically correct: ...'AN open ended question...... and then ranked THEM.

Response: Thank-you. This has been corrected.

Added to the text: and then rank the outcomes

p4/line 50: satisfaction of what specifically?

Response: Agree, this may be ambiguous.

Added to the text: …..satisfaction with their surgical outcome,
p5/line 8-10: the 'high volume' notion seems to be an American expression, difficult to understand as a European, also as repeated twice, in my view this is unhelpful.

Response: There is a relationship between volume and outcomes for surgical procedures that has been well studied in the US, and has been referenced in the discussion for clarity.

Added to discussion under limitations: …… Patients receiving their joint replacements in high volume hospitals are more likely to be satisfied with their outcomes, so we included the survey results for clarity (24,25).

references added:


p5/line18: who contacted the non-responders by telephone/email, the surgeons who invited patients initially?

Response: The patients were contacted by research assistants who were members of the research team.

p5/35: why is marital status important to include in the basic characteristics, what impact did this status have on the outcomes, not clear to me.

Response: It is an important socio-demographic characteristic of study cohort, routinely collected with patient age and race, and presented in Table 1.

p5/line58: what do the authors mean by 'overall satisfaction', this notion is too vague and not clear to the reader in my view.

Response: The questionnaire description has been expanded for clarity.

Added to text: In addition, patients completed a questionnaire describing their satisfaction with their surgical outcome in four areas: pain relief, functional improvement for
housework/yardwork, improving ability to do recreational activities, and overall satisfaction. Each area was answered in a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied.

p7/line16: the data was re-analysed, how is that possible without transcribing the group sessions, this is very unclear to me, how did you include all the accounts (which bring the paper much more alive) how was the process from audio recorded nominal group meetings to obtaining data handled without transcribing the content of the sessions, resulting in a thematic analysis?

Response: We regret the confusion. Sessions recordings were reviewed to ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the nominated responses.

Added to the text: The recorded discussions were subsequently reviewed for accuracy and completeness of the nominated responses.

p7/line40: pl provide a relevant reference for the data saturation, this is a very important and delicate point in the qual research method.

Added to the text: The sessions were continued until theme saturation was confirmed, and no new themes emerged. Saunders,B.; Sim,J.; Kingstone,T.; Baker,S.; Waterfield,J.; Bartlam,B.; Burroughs,H.; Jinks,C. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization Qual.Quant., 2018, 52, 4, 1893-1907,

p11/line19: why did the author state that this was a 'significant theme', unclear to me, how was the theme more significant to the other ones?

Response: Agree, the wording is not clear

Changed in the text: This was a significant theme and received…..

p12/line30:....'we sampled from a practice.....', pl change to 'we recruited or invited participants from a practice', as we are dealing with people. Basic Characteristic Table: pl explain what a homemaker is for non-American readers.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion

Changed in the text: so we sampled invited participants from a practice with……..

Added to table

*homemaker-someone who manages a home