

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)	SocialBit: Protocol for a Prospective Observational Study to Validate a Wearable Social Sensor for Stroke Survivors with Diverse Neurological Abilities
AUTHORS	White, Kelly; Tate, Samuel; Zafonte, Ross; Narayanan, Shrikanth; Mehl, Matthias R.; Shin, Min; Dhand, Amar

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Imura, Takeshi Hiroshima Cosmopolitan University
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Jun-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is the study protocol that were planned for establishment the validity and utility of SocialBit to detect social isolation in stroke survivors. The study protocol is well-designed, and the manuscript adequately includes important information such as study background and study methods.</p> <p>Although the manuscript is written well, I have few comments as indicated below to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The authors would better to provide the information related to hospital room (e.g. a private room or a room with several beds) of both hospitals because this room environment also affects the acquisition of socializing ability after stroke onset.2. Also, the authors need to describe the content and quantity of rehabilitation that will provide in both hospitals because this also affects the acquisition of socializing ability after stroke onset.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

REVIEWER 1'S COMMENTS AND OUR RESPONSE

This is the study protocol that were planned for establishment the validity and utility of SocialBit to detect social isolation in stroke survivors. The study protocol is well-designed, and the manuscript adequately includes important information such as study background and study methods.

Although the manuscript is written well, I have few comments as indicated below to improve the quality of the manuscript.

1. The authors would better to provide the information related to hospital room (e.g. a private room or a room with several beds) of both hospitals because this room environment also affects the acquisition of socializing ability after stroke onset.

We added a section describing the hospital rooms in both hospitals to the Methods section (page 8, paragraph 2).

“At Brigham and Women’s Hospital, participants usually stay in shared rooms with one roommate. The focus is on acute care with modest inpatient rehabilitation services. At Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital Boston, participants stay in private rooms and receive at least 3 hours of intensive therapy (physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech therapy).”

2. Also, the authors need to describe the content and quantity of rehabilitation that will provide in both hospitals because this also affects the acquisition of socializing ability after stroke onset.

We added details on the content and quantity of rehabilitation at each site (page 8, paragraph 2).

“At Brigham and Women’s Hospital, participants usually stay in shared rooms with one roommate. The focus is on acute care with modest inpatient rehabilitation services. At Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital Boston, participants stay in private rooms and receive at least 3 hours of intensive therapy (physical therapy, occupational therapy, and speech therapy).”