

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Patients' values and preferences of the expected efficacy of hip arthroscopy for osteoarthritis: A protocol for a multinational structured interview-based study combined with a randomized survey on the optimal amount of information to elicit preferences
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Zhang, Yuqing; Tikkinen, Kari; Agoritsas, Thomas; Ayeni, Olufemi; Alexander, Paul; Imam, Maha; Yoo, Daniel; Tsalatsanis, Athanasios; Djulbegovic, Benjamin; Thabane, Lehana; Schünemann, Holger; Guyatt, Gordon

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Amy Lloyd Cardiff University, UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	23-Jun-2014

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The article is nicely written, but the discussion could be strengthened. The authors provide a good summary of the strengths of the study; potential weaknesses need to be acknowledged (e.g. potential difference between anticipated and actual regret).</p> <p>The proposed study is extremely interesting and an important contribution to the field.</p> <p>A few minor points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Page 8, fourth paragraph: May be useful to provide an indication of reading age.</li><li>- Page 10, lines 7-12: Sentence difficult to understand - may benefit from revision.</li></ul> <p>Page 10, line 15: Typo - interview</p> <p>Page 10, line 52: Should read patients finish (or patient finishes).</p> <p>Page 13, final paragraph: Authors suggest there is indirect evidence that patients' decision making is influenced by family and friends. This point is not clear in the main body of the paper. The authors may wish to read/reference Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. <i>Sociol Heal Illn</i> 2008;30:429-44</p> <p>Page 14, line 11: Typo – judgement</p> <p>Great study - looking forward to the findings. My only concern is that there is not enough difference between the long and short health</p>
-------------------------	--

	scenarios. I wonder if the authors have considered using different formats?
--	---

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: Amy Lloy

1. Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

We have now stated: "Competing interests: None declared"

2. The article is nicely written, but the discussion could be strengthened. The authors provide a good summary of the strengths of the study; potential weaknesses need to be acknowledged (e.g. potential difference between anticipated and actual regret).

The proposed study is extremely interesting and an important contribution to the field.

We thank the reviewer for this generous assessment.

We acknowledged the limitations of our study in the protocol as follow:

"Our study plan also has limitations. There are conceptual limitations to the anticipated regret exercise. For instance, no one has studied the relationship between anticipated regret and actual regret subsequently experienced. If we find important discrepancies between anticipated regret and the trade-off exercise the interpretation may be challenging; in particular, it may remain uncertain which method better represents patients' real preference. Subsequent studies may be needed to address such questions arising from our results."

3. A few minor points:

- Page 8, fourth paragraph: May be useful to provide an indication of reading age.

We have added the details in the manuscript as follow:

"We also used the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level test in Microsoft Word 2011 to ensure the English is understandable for people with grade 10 level education."

4. - Page 10, lines 7-12: Sentence difficult to understand - may benefit from revision.

Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion.

We have reworded the sentence as below:

"We will consider the pilot stage (approximately 2 months) to be successful, and a large multicenter RCT to be feasible if: (i) we successfully recruit 20% of the patients according to our estimated sample size in 2 months; (ii) we will be able to finish the interview and all the outcome assessment in approximately one hour. (See table 3 for outcomes and corresponding objectives)."

Page 10, line 15: Typo - interview

We have corrected the typo. We thank the reviewer for the meticulous care in the review.

Page 10, line 52: Should read patients finish (or patient finishes).

We have corrected the mistake as below:

"After patients finish reading both... "

Page 13, final paragraph: Authors suggest there is indirect evidence that patients' decision making is influenced by family and friends. This point is not clear in the main body of the paper. The authors may wish to read/reference Rapley T. Distributed decision making: the anatomy of decisions-in-action. *Sociol Health Illn* 2008;30:429–44

Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion.

We have addressed the issue in the body of the paper in the outcome section and added the citation in the discussion section:

“Secondary outcomes:

Independent predictors of the primary outcome include age, gender, educational level, socioeconomic status, and family/friends' experiences with previous THA or/and HA. “

Page 14, line 11: Typo - judgement

We have corrected the typo.

Great study - looking forward to the findings. My only concern is that there is not enough difference between the long and short health scenarios. I wonder if the authors have considered using different formats?

The reviewer has a good point. However, we need to use plausible optimal formats. Our judgment was that a shorter short version is unlikely to be optimal and a longer long version is unlikely to be optimal. It would be unfortunate to compare two formats when one or both are not plausibly optimal. Both the short and long formats we have chosen are, in our view, plausibly optimal.