

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)	Knowledge of and attitudes toward clinical trials in Saudi Arabia: a cross-sectional study
AUTHORS	Deeb, Ahmad; Al Rawashdeh, Nedal; Damsees, Rana; Al-Jeraisy, Majed; Al Qasim, Eman

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jamie Roberts Duke Clinical and Translational Science Institute Duke University Durham, NC USA
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Jun-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Please see my comments in the attached PDF -- my greatest concerns are for simple edits to ensure that the language chosen is appropriate and that numbers used are clearly defined. I reviewed but did not double check the statistics but think they should be closely reviewed by the editors.</p> <p>The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	William G Henderson Adult and Child Consortium for Outcomes Research and Delivery Science University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus USA
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jun-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a useful study of knowledge & attitudes about clinical trials in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia general public; previous studies have been done only in specific health care settings. The manuscript could be improved in understanding and in better writing. I had these specific suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. p. 8 Sample size--It is not clear why "0.05 margin of error" means. It is surprising that the sample size estimate was 385 which they arbitrarily increased to 1000 to adequately represent all regions and then some of the regions were still as low as 26 participants.2. p. 9, line 46-47--I am not sure what "blooms" are.3. p.10--Why was Cronbach alpha done for both K&A together in the pilot, and then separately in the main study?4. p.10--for the generalized linear model it would be good to specify the independent variables.5. p.11--It would be good to compare the sample participant characteristics to the general Saudi population, at least on some
-------------------------	--

	<p>characteristics which would be known for both groups--for example, gender, age, income, marital status, etc.</p> <p>6. There are numerous grammatical mistakes throughout the paper. It would be good to have a person with a major in English review and make corrections to the paper.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Prof. Jamie Roberts
 Duke Clinical and Translational Science Institute
 Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

Comment: Please see my comments in the attached PDF -- my greatest concerns are for simple edits to ensure that the language chosen is appropriate and that numbers used are clearly defined. I reviewed but did not double check the statistics but think they should be closely reviewed by the editors.

Reply: Thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript and we appreciate your valuable comments that aim to enhance the quality of this study. We replied on all raised comments on the attached PDF file and the manuscript was modified accordingly. For your kind information, this manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation and spelling by a qualified native English speaking person (please see the attached editing certificate).

Reviewer #2:

Prof. William G Henderson
 Adult and Child Consortium for Outcomes Research and Delivery Science,
 University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, USA

Comment: This is a useful study of knowledge & attitudes about clinical trials in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia general public; previous studies have been done only in specific health care settings. The manuscript could be improved in understanding and in better writing.

Reply: Thank you for taking the time to review this manuscript and we appreciate your valuable comments that aim to enhance the quality of this study. For your kind information, this manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation and spelling by a qualified native English speaking person (please see the attached editing certificate).

Comment: p. 8 Sample size--It is not clear whay "0.05 margin of error" means. It is surprising that the sample size estimate was 385 which they arbitrarily increased to 1000 to adequately represent all regions and then some of the regions were still as low as 26 participants.

Reply: Thank you for this comment. The minimum sample size calculated for this study was 385 using the most common parameters margin of errors 5% and 95% confidence intervals. We increased our sample to 1000 to reduce the sampling errors (the paragraph under sample size section was corrected). Failure to adequately representing all regions is related to using a convenient sampling method. This limitation was discussed in the manuscript.

Comment: p. 9, line 46-47--I am not sure what "blooms" are.

Reply: Thank you for comment. This was a typo error and it was corrected in the manuscript (Bloom's).

Comment: p.10--Why was Cronbach alpha done for both K&A together in the pilot, and then separately in the main study?

Reply: Thank you for raising this point. We removed Cronbach alpha values for the main study.

Comment: p.10--for the generalized linear model it would be good to specify the independent variables.

Reply: Thank you for comment. We listed all independent variables in the statistical analysis section as requested.

Comment: p.11--It would be good to compare the sample participant characteristics to the general Saudi population, at least on some characteristics which would be known for both groups--for example, gender, age, income, marital status, etc.

Reply: Thank you for this comment. We elaborated more about this under the discussion (study limitation).

Comment: There are numerous grammatical mistakes throughout the paper. It would be good to have a person with a major in English review and make corrections to the paper.

Reply: Thank you for comment. The manuscript was sent for native English language reviewer (English language review certificate attached)

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jamie Roberts Clinical and Translational Science Institute - Duke University, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Jul-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>All in all this is written much better and I appreciate the care the author's took to respond to reviewers' comments and suggestions.</p> <p>There are still a few grammatical and formatting issues to be addressed. Given the authors' response that they used a certified English translation for the first version I reviewed, I would suggest that they carefully choose their next translator as they should be concerned about any money spent on a native English speaker's translation that resulted in their first submission.</p> <p>I've made some edits and added some comments to the word version. I've also set it up so that only my edits are seen to ensure that they are not lost in the "noise" of all the other edits.</p> <p>The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	William G Henderson Adult and Child Consortium for Research and Delivery Science
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Aug-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Revisions are adequate
-------------------------	------------------------

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Prof. Jamie Roberts

Duke Clinical and Translational Science Institute

Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

Comment: All in all this is written much better and I appreciate the care the author's took to respond to reviewers' comments and suggestions.

Reply: Thank you for the positive feedback and we appreciate your time and effort to review this manuscript.

Comment: There are still a few grammatical and formatting issues to be addressed. Given the authors' response that they used a certified English translation for the first version I reviewed, I would suggest that they carefully choose their next translator as they should be concerned about any money spent on a native English speaker's translation that resulted in their first submission.

I've made some edits and added some comments to the word version. I've also set it up so that only my edits are seen to ensure that they are not lost in the "noise" of all the other edits. See attached.

Reply: Thank you very much for this comment. We have addressed all comments and made changes to the manuscript as requested.

Reviewer #2:

Prof. William G Henderson

Adult and Child Consortium for Outcomes Research and Delivery Science,

University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, USA

Comment: Revisions are adequate

Reply: Thank you for the positive feedback and we appreciate your time and effort to review this manuscript.