

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)	Impact of omitting annual reviews for COPD on patient-reported care quality – outcomes from the Asthma + Lung COPD patient passport
AUTHORS	Williams, Parris; Bachir, Leena; Philip, Keir; Cumella, Andrew; Polkey, Mike; Laverty, Anthony; Hopkinson, Nicholas

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Georges Khattar Staten Island University Hospital, Internal Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Feb-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The study is very well done. The findings underscore the importance of annual reviews in maintaining and improving care quality for COPD patients.</p> <p>The limitations of the study are mostly covered.</p> <p>While the study is thorough in identifying problems within current care practices, it indeed falls short by not suggesting concrete solutions or interventions to address these identified gaps. The authors perspective on potential strategies to ensure regular reviews, improve patient education, and enhance care quality would have enriched the manuscript.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Philip Masel The Prince Charles Hospital, Metro North Hospital and Health Service
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Feb-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an interesting paper which emphasizes the importance of annual reviews in this vulnerable population. There a few typos. Overall, it reads well and the figures are clear and well presented. There is useful discussion on the role of social determinants in COPD outcomes. There is a good correlation between patient's outcomes and their perceptions. The conclusion is well described and is an important message.</p> <p>Are patients aware that their data could be used for research when they login into Asthma and Lung UK COPD Patient Passport website?</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Georges Khattar, Staten Island University Hospital

Comments to the Author:

The study is very well done. The findings underscore the importance of annual reviews in maintaining and improving care quality for COPD patients.

The limitations of the study are mostly covered.

While the study is thorough in identifying problems within current care practices, it indeed falls short by not suggesting concrete solutions or interventions to address these identified gaps. The authors perspective on potential strategies to ensure regular reviews, improve patient education, and enhance care quality would have enriched the manuscript.

Thank you for these comments, we have added suggestions for interventions to address these care gaps within the discussion section of the manuscript. Please see tracked changes document.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Philip Masel, The Prince Charles Hospital

Comments to the Author:

This is an interesting paper which emphasizes the importance of annual reviews in this vulnerable population. There a few typos. Overall, it reads well and the figures are clear and well presented. There is useful discussion on the role of social determinants in COPD outcomes. There is a good correlation between patient's outcomes and their perceptions. The conclusion is well described and is an important message.

Are patients aware that their data could be used for research when they login into Asthma and Lung UK COPD Patient Passport website?

Thankyou for the comments, patients consent to their data being used when they undertake the annual COPD survey. As mentioned above, the COPD passport doesn't contain any demographic data, and Asthma + Lung UK's information governance team approved the use of the data for research purposes.