

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)	Improving the quality of the performance and delivery of continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) to critically ill patients across a healthcare system – QUALITY CRRT: A Study Protocol
AUTHORS	Opgenorth, Dawn; Reil, Ellen; Lau, Vincent; Fraser, Nancy; Zuege, Danny; Wang, Xiaoming; Bagshaw, Sean; Rewa, Oleksa

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Nalos, Marek Nepean Hospital ICU
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Interesting study proposal and protocol. Perhaps monitoring and KPI development for dialysis catheters could be specifically mentioned apart from cost.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Cove, Matthew National University Hospital
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the invitation to review this manuscript. The authors describe the protocol of an ambitious quality improvement project to explore the use of KPI reporting to improve outcomes in critically ill patients receiving CRRT. I have a few concerns with the manuscript as written.</p> <p>(1) It is unclear how the authors plan to assess HRQoL. There is no clear plan to follow up with HRQoL questionnaire, and this would not likely be possible without consent.</p> <p>(2) There are a few sentences that need tidying up, eg Page 7 line 32.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Marek Nalos, Nepean Hospital ICU

Comments to the Author:

Interesting study proposal and protocol. Perhaps monitoring and KPI development for dialysis catheters could be specifically mentioned apart from cost.

Thank you for this comment. You are correct in your statement that monitoring and KPI development is important in this program. We have made this explicit in our Objectives and Research Questions on page 5 and have expanded our primary objective to now read as follows:

“The primary objective is to improve the quality of care delivered to critically ill patients receiving CRRT in Alberta, as measured by CRRT KPI development, monitoring and performance.”

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Matthew Cove, National University Hospital

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for the invitation to review this manuscript. The authors describe the protocol of an ambitious quality improvement project to explore the use of KPI reporting to improve outcomes in critically ill patients receiving CRRT. I have a few concerns with the manuscript as written.

(1) It is unclear how the authors plan to assess HRQoL. There is no clear plan to follow up with HRQoL questionnaire, and this would not likely be possible without consent.

Thank you for this comment. We have clarified our strategy which allows for our healthcare system to send out letters to patients which will then give them the option of contacting the study team to fill out these questionnaires. This has now been clarified on page 13 to read as follows:

“Patients will be sent letters with study team contact information in order for them to contact our team in order to complete these questionnaires.”

(2) There are a few sentences that need tidying up, eg Page 7 line 32.

Thank you for bringing these to our attention. Several sentences have been simplified and have been highlighted throughout the text.