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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for let me review this paper and I have the following comments for the authors to consider.

Background:

p.3/line 38: Pl provide relevant reference after first sentence, as I think the statement needs to be backed up by publications.

p.3./line 41: 'patients reported that they are dissatisfied', unsure what they were dissatisfied about, pl specify.

Methods:

I am a qualitative researcher, so I hope another reviewer can comments on the Questionnaire results and its appropriateness and results.

p.4/line 69/70: 'high volume' was mentioned twice, why?

p.4/line 76/77: pl add Reference number and date for the Ethics Review Board approval, it was not mentioned at the end of the paper too.

p.4/line 79: did patients signed written and informed consent, at the moment it states only informed, pl clarify.

p.5/line 83-84: the question in relation to satisfaction of surgery is not clear in my view, pl provide more information what aspects before, during or after the surgery the satisfaction related to.

p 5/line 95: where where the patient discussion groups held, pl specify.

p.6/line 106: who transcribed the discussion group content?
p.6/line 107: how was the qualitative data analysed, what approach was taken, ?thematic analysis? Pl expand.

p.6/line 117: good move to include two groups with younger participants.

Results:
This whole section I suggest needs further work, at the moment the content is too dense, it is very difficult to keep the reader engaged, Suggestions: group the accounts into themes and sub-themes, have the accounts indented in the text with different font and add denominators after each account, e.g. NT Group 3, female, age so the reader has a better overview and idea where the accounts come from.

Discussion:

p.12/lines 254-279: far too many repetitions of the same words, e.g. 'improved', and 'important' throughout the sections, the reader will not stay engaged, in my view.

The whole section does not provide any new information, specifically as OMERACT has come up with the same findings, however from quant. studies and systematic reviews, so I am unsure what extra value the study brings. The authors did not include other studies that had different outcomes.

The suggestion for young people &gt;45 years to provide a support group for comes to me out of the blue, where did the suggestion come from and why? Support groups come in all shapes and forms, e.g. in person, online, chat rooms?

Although stated in the limitations, the participants seemed to be a selective group of well educated patients with hardly any pain, a similar study with a more diverse group would probably come up with other findings.

The authors also stated other factors such as emotional impact, self confidence etc. need to be further explore, in my view these were highlighted by the patients in their discussion groups already, however, as the data analysis is not clearly described, such findings were not identified enough in this study.

Do not understand why Table 1-3 was listed x2.

In summary: I cannot recommend the paper to be published in the current form, due to (i) selection bias of participants, (ii), no new findings identified due to the work of OMERACT , despite the fact this study had a qual approach, and (iii) lack of detailed data analysis.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal