

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)	Sex differences in clinical outcomes for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in the United States: a retrospective observational study of administrative claims data
AUTHORS	Butzner, Michael; Leslie, Douglas; Cuffee, Yendelela; Hollenbeak, Christopher; Sciamanna, Christopher; Abraham, Theodore

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	He, Chao-Jie The First Hospital of Jiaying, The Affiliated Hospital of Jiaying University
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Nov-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>It is interesting authors did a study to explore the sex differences in clinical outcomes for obstructive hypertrophic cardiomyopathy in the United States. I think the sample size is large and the conclusion is reliable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The figure should account to three decimal places. The decimals should stay the same in the whole text. 2. A main limitation is MarketScan includes only individuals with private insurance (no Medicaid or Medicare) and these results may not be generalizable to patients with other types of health insurance or who are uninsured. 3. The manuscript is well-written, only need minor revision.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Pelliccia, Francesco Sapienza University
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors of this study address a very interesting point and provides important results. They included a large patient population with HCM. The methods are correct, results are clear, and discussion is original. The article can be of interest to the general readers of the Journal.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1
Dr. Chao-Jie He, The First Hospital of Jiaying, The Affiliated Hospital of Jiaying University

Comments to the Author:

1. The figure should account to three decimal places. The decimals should stay the same in the whole text.

Thank you for your comment. The authors believe you are referring to our p-values in the figures. We have edited figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 to update all decimals to three places per your recommendation. Additionally, and for consistency, we updated the results section and table 1 to reflect p-values of three decimal places.

2. A main limitation is MarketScan includes only individuals with private insurance (no Medicaid or Medicare) and these results may not be generalizable to patients with other types of health insurance or who are uninsured.

Thank you for your thorough review and insightful comment. We agree that this is a true limitation of our study and address this in our limitations section with the line "MarketScan includes only individuals with private insurance (no Medicaid or Medicare) and these results may not be generalizable to patients with other types of health insurance or who are uninsured." Nevertheless, the authors believe a major strength of this study is the ability to provide the first data on sex differences in treatment and outcomes in a large, national sample of patients diagnosed with oHCM in the US and warrant publication in BMJ Open. No changes were made to the manuscript in reference to this reviewer comment.

3. The manuscript is well-written, only need minor revision.

Thank you for your thorough review and kind words of support for our manuscript. The authors greatly appreciate your time and effort. There are no actionable items from this reviewer comment, thus no changes were made to the manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Francesco Pelliccia, Sapienza University

Comments to the Author:

The authors of this study address a very interesting point and provides important results. They included a large patient population with HCM. The methods are correct, results are clear, and discussion is original. The article can be of interest to the general readers of the Journal.

Thank you for your thorough review and kind words of support for our manuscript. The authors greatly appreciate your time and effort. There are no actionable items from this reviewer comment, thus no changes were made to the manuscript.