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.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	A cohort study of health care use, costs and diagnoses from onset to 6 months after discharge for takotsubo syndrome in Sweden
AUTHORS	Wallström, Sara; Ekman, Inger; Omerovic, Elmir; Ulin, Kerstin; Gyllensten, Hanna

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Thanh Ha Nguyen University of Adelaide, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Dec-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have addressed the issues raised in the limitations of the study.

REVIEWER	Dr Elizabeth Stokes Senior Researcher, Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Dec-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The first two points have been addressed comprehensively. Regarding the final query about changing from imputing missing values using the median rather than the mean, I remain of the opinion that mean imputation would be more appropriate. However, I accept that using the median is a more conservative method, so if that is still your preference, I suggest that your rationale for choosing imputation using the median, i.e. that it provides a conservative estimate, is clearly stated in the paper. In looking back at Table 2 to review the above point, I am unclear on whether all the figures in the table include the imputed costs, or just some of them. If they are included in all costs, I am unclear on the following: In the row for 'Hospitalisation', the total cost under 'Inpatient care' is 430,362. The total cost for all care in the final column is 418,840 - why is this different, when there are no costs for outpatient or primary care? Similarly for the 'Index admission' the total cost under 'Inpatient care' is 260,623 but in the final column this is 249,101. Why are these different? In the final row, 604+298=902 not 904?

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Reviewer Name: Thanh Ha Nguyen
Institution and Country: University of Adelaide, Australia
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared.

Please leave your comments for the authors below The authors have addressed the issues raised in the limitations of the study.
Response: Thank you for reviewing the manuscript.

Reviewer: 2
Reviewer Name: Dr Elizabeth Stokes
Institution and Country: Senior Researcher, Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, UK
Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below Thank you for responding to my three minor comments.

The first two points have been addressed comprehensively.
Response: Thank you.

Regarding the final query about changing from imputing missing values using the median rather than the mean, I remain of the opinion that mean imputation would be more appropriate. However, I accept that using the median is a more conservative method, so if that is still your preference, I suggest that your rationale for choosing imputation using the median, i.e. that it provides a conservative estimate, is clearly stated in the paper.
Response: Thank you. We have added this note to the method section of the manuscript.

In looking back at Table 2 to review the above point, I am unclear on whether all the figures in the table include the imputed costs, or just some of them. If they are included in all costs, I am unclear on the following:
In the row for 'Hospitalisation', the total cost under 'Inpatient care' is 430,362. The total cost for all care in the final column is 418,840 - why is this different, when there are no costs for outpatient or primary care?
Similarly for the 'Index admission' the total cost under 'Inpatient care' is 260,623 but in the final column this is 249,101. Why are these different?
In the final row, 604+298=902 not 904?
Response: Thank you for this keen observation. We have corrected all of these numbers in the table.