

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy (OPAT) versus inpatient care in the UK: a health economic assessment for six key diagnoses
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Dimitrova, Maria; Gilchrist, Mark; Seaton, R. A.

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Ntziora, Fotinie Laiko General Hospital
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	08-Mar-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a well-written paper assessing health economics for six key diagnosis, namely Skin and soft tissue infections, Orthopaedic infections (bone and joint), Diabetic foot infections, Complex urinary tract infections, Bronchiectasis and Intra-abdominal infections, all of which require intravenous antibiotic administration for a long period of time. This study provides high quality data across health care delivery models based on outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy (OPAT) using UK-specific registry. The authors have clearly and analytically described the diverse patient cases that need attention within an OPAT environment. There are clear definitions of the various methods used as well as health economics data input. The findings from a comprehensive list of scenarios showed consistency with those from base cases. Discussion includes relevant literature review supporting these findings and also sets challenges that remain to be answered in future research projects.</p> <p>Minor typo Page 9 Line 41 ( )</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Resende , Mariângela Ribeiro UNICAMP, Faculty of Medical Sciences - Infectious Diseases
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	08-Jul-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The manuscript presents a health economic analysis in different modalities of OPAT considering the most prevalent infections in a UK perspective.</p> <p>In a cost-minimization study the benefits and cost savings of OPAT were showed based on accurate database. Some limitations were stated and maybe the most important it is the clinical outcome that was considered the same for the outpatient and inpatient. Maybe it is different however in the direction for economic advantage for the OPAT.. Patient perspective was not evaluated it is a very important point that was cited during the discussion section.</p>
-------------------------	--

	This manuscript adds relevant contribution for this research topic.
--	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 comments: Minor typo Page 9 Line 41 ( )

Author's response: Typo corrected

Reviewer 2 comments: Patient perspective was not evaluated it is a very important point that was cited during the discussion section.

Author's response: Patient perspective on OPAT was not addressed in this manuscript although as noted by reviewer 2 it has been highlighted as a crucial aspect of OPAT within the final paragraph of the discussion.

I hope that our manuscript is now acceptable for publication

Many thanks

Yours sincerely

Dr R Andrew Seaton on behalf of the authors

### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Resende , Mariângela Ribeiro UNICAMP, Faculty of Medical Sciences - Infectious Diseases
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	07-Sep-2021
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The manuscript underwent to minor revision; all suggestions were incorporated to final version.