

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)	Comparison of a single high-sensitivity cardiac Troponin T measurement with the HEART score for rapid rule-out of acute myocardial infarction in a primary care emergency setting: a cohort study
AUTHORS	Johannessen, Tonje; Atar, Dan; Vallersnes, Odd Martin; Larstorp, A. C. K.; Mdala, Ibrahimu; Halvorsen, Sigrun

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Abdulrhman Alghamdi King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences, Saudi Arabia University of Manchester, UK I received funding from Abbott Point of Care (Priceton, New Jersey USA) and donation of reagents from Roche Diagnostics International Ltd. (Risch- Rotkreuz, Switzerland) and LumiraDx (Waltham, Massachusetts USA).
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Nov-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for addressing my comments and suggestions; I just have one additional question. In the outcome measures section, the other mentioned “two low-risk HEART scores”, do they mean Original HEART low-risk and Modified HEART low-risk, if so please clarify this in the manuscript
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Neumann, J University Heart Center, Hamburg
REVIEW RETURNED	11-Dec-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	In the present manuscript the authors present data from the previously published OUT-ACS study. Here, the value of a single troponin rule-out strategy was investigated in a low-risk population and compared to the HEART score. The manuscript is well written and the analyses are reasonable. Limitations are acknowledged appropriately and thus I have only minor comments: - Please report the time from admission to hs-cTnT measurement. This will allow a better understanding of the actual timeframe within the ED - References: Reference 2 should be replaced by the new, 2020 ESC guideline
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer: 1

Thank you for addressing my comments and suggestions; I just have one additional question. In the outcome measures section, the other mentioned "two low-risk HEART scores", do they mean Original HEART low-risk and Modified HEART low-risk, if so please clarify this in the manuscript.

- Thank you for this comment. This has now been altered as suggested. We have also added "original" to every "HEART score" throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion with the modified version.

Reviewer: 2

In the present manuscript the authors present data from the previously published OUT-ACS study. Here, the value of a single troponin rule-out strategy was investigated in a low-risk population and compared to the HEART score. The manuscript is well written and the analyses are reasonable. Limitations are acknowledged appropriately and thus I have only minor comments: Please report the time from admission to hs-cTnT measurement. This will allow a better understanding of the actual timeframe within the ED.

- The median time from OAEOC presentation to first hs-cTnT measurement was 136 minutes (IQR 100-194 min).
- The main reason for this delay was that the OUT-ACS study comprised patients considered as low-to-intermediate risk for ACS (not in need of urgent hospitalisation). Therefore, the patients often had to wait for the initial GP examination.
- The time from admission to blood sampling has now been added under Results (page 11), and the delay is discussed in the Discussion section (page 17).

References: Reference 2 should be replaced by the new, 2020 ESC guideline

- We fully agree. The 2015 ESC guideline has now been replaced by the ESC 2020 guideline throughout the manuscript.