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)	Development and evaluatIon of a patient deciSion aid for patients Considering ongoing medical or sUrgical treatment optionS for ulcerative colitis using a mixed-methods approach: protocol for DISCUSS study.
AUTHORS	Baker, Daniel; Lee, Matthew; Folan, Anne-Mairead; Blackwell, Sue; Robinson, Kerry; Wootton, Rebecca; Sebastian, Shaji; Brown, Steven; Jones, Georgina; Lobo, Alan

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dmitri Nepogodiev NIHR Unit on Global Surgery, University of Birmingham, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Jun-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	This study addresses an important gap The methods are appropriate and mostly described in detail The study team is multidisciplinary and very experienced A few comments: 1.Are any of the components of the overarching study registered e.g. reviews in Prospero? 2. For the systematic review it would be helpful to have additional detail information on inclusion/exclusion criteria and exactly what data is being collected. This could go in to a web appendix. 3. For the study components that require patient recruitment, how will the researchers ensure that a representative sample of patients are recruited - with respect to age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, socioeconomic group etc? 4. Only adults will be recruited in stage 3 and the abstract says theat the study is aimed at adults. Perhaps this could also be included in the study objectives to clarify that the whole programme is only about adults?

REVIEWER	Lowenberg AmsterdamUMC Location AMC The Netherlands
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Jul-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Well written protocol covering an clinically relevant topic. They propose to conduct a multi-disciplinary, collaborative pilot study with clinicians and patients aiming to develop, assess and

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031845 on 14 January 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on March 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

	finally validate a patient decision tool for patients considering surgery for ulcerative colitis, in order to improve patient knowledge and aid these complex decision-making processes; i.e. whether to continue medical treatment or to undergo surgery One minor comment: maybe specify/ define the different outcome parameters more clearly? In addition, how will they select these items? By a thorough literature review (systematic review), etc?

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1;

'1.Are any of the components of the overarching study registered e.g. reviews in Prospero?'

- All our reviews are registered on PROSERO, we have added in their reference numbers into the methods section for clarity. (Page 9 and 10)

'2. For the systematic review it would be helpful to have additional detail information on inclusion/exclusion criteria and exactly what data is being collected. This could go in to a web appendix.'

- We have now included a supplementary table for each systematic review which details the inclusion and exclusion criteria for each review.

'3. For the study components that require patient recruitment, how will the researchers ensure that a representative sample of patients are recruited - with respect to age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, socioeconomic group etc?'

- We described in our manuscript how we will utilise purposive sampling for patient recruitment. We have added another sentence in for clarity detailing that this will ensure a representative sample. (Page 11)

'4. Only adults will be recruited in stage 3 and the abstract says theat the study is aimed at adults. Perhaps this could also be included in the study objectives to clarify that the whole programme is only about adults?'

- Thank you for this. We have added into the study objectives that this is for adult patients. (Page 7)

Reviewer 2

'One minor comment: maybe specify/ define the different outcome parameters more clearly? In addition, how will they select these items? By a thorough literature review (systematic review), etc?'

- The outcomes included in our aid will be guided by systematic reviews and patient questionnaires, which is included in the methodology section for stage 1 (pages 8,9,10). We have included a supplementary table to reflect Reviewer 1's suggestion above, that explicitly states the inclusion and exclusion criteria for our systematic reviews. This should allow readers to understand how we have arrived at our outcomes.

'Figure should not be pixelated

Please provide better qualities figures, ensuring the figures are not pixelated when zoomed in. We also request that they have a resolution of at least 300 dpi and 90mm x 90mm of width.'

- Thank you for highlighting this to us. We have now amended our figures so that they are 300 dpi and submitted them saved as a PDF file as this worked best with your online system. Should there be any further issues please do let us know.

'Patient and Public Involvement:

Authors must include a statement in the methods section of the manuscript under the sub-heading 'Patient and Public Involvement'.'

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031845 on 14 January 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on March 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

- Thank you for highlighting. We have now added in a section under the heading 'Patient and Public Involvement' which provides details on how patients are involved in the development and conduct of our study. (Page 15)

We hope these amendments address the queries raised by the reviewers. We would be happy to answer any further queries on the manuscript.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031845 on 14 January 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on March 28, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.