

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)	Does Achieving the Best Practice Tariff Improve Outcomes in Hip Fracture Patients? An Observational Cohort Study
AUTHORS	Oakley, Ben; Nightingale, Jessica; Moran, Christopher; Moppett, Iain

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Martyn Parker Peterborough city hospital
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Sep-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	This article clearly has some interest and relevance. A larger number of patients in different centres would provide more information but this article presents a useful start on this topic and as such I feel the article is suitable for publication in this journal.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Sameer Khan Trauma & Orthopaedics Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust Ashington Northumberland NE63 9JJ UK
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Sep-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thanks for asking me to review. I have a few suggestions, but on the whole I believe it should be published. I congratulate the authors on their effort. The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Thank you for your review of the manuscript, the reviewer's comments are appreciated. We have redrafted the manuscript taking these considerations into account and have included data from the latest NHFD report, we therefore wish to resubmit the manuscript for your consideration. Please find a list of changes below, they are also highlighted and commented within the manuscript itself.

1. The study design has been included in the title
2. Within the abstract, the outcome measures sentence has been rephrased to include the specific outcome measure of interest and its application to both an individual and the population.

3. Within the abstract under the setting heading, the relationship of the hospital to the University of Nottingham has been clarified.
4. Within the abstract under the results heading, the opening sentence has been rephrased to clarify that there is no difference in mortality between the pre and post BPT cohorts. Thus avoiding confusion with the difference in mortality when comparing those who achieved BPT in comparison to those who did not.
5. Under the strengths and limitations of the study, the comment regarding the quality of data and its prospective collection has been removed. Although the data is of high quality we accept that the database has its limitations.
6. Within the introduction, the statement that hip fractures are predicted to rise to over 100,000 a year has been moved from the second paragraph to the opening sentence. It reads well in the opening sentence and quantifies the increasing burden of hip fractures.
7. In the first paragraph of the introduction the 30 day mortality, acute hospital and overall length of stay data has been updated in light of the new 2016 NHFD report. Unfortunately this data comes from the NHFD hence we do not have access to the raw data in order to be able to calculate the IQR or range.
8. The referencing for the opening paragraph has been amended, taking into account the above changes.
9. Within table 2, the SD for the NHFS has been removed upon advice of the reviewer. The mean NHFS has been kept as there are significant differences between the cohorts.
10. Within the discussion (paragraph 5), a paragraph has been added attempting to explain the difference in the ratio of males achieving BPT. This association has not been reported before hence may be a chance finding. However, a significantly higher proportion of males in the post-BPT cohort had more than two co-morbidities and were more likely to have delayed surgery which may explain this finding.
11. In the footnotes an ethics statement has been added to the main manuscript to clarify that this study falls under the remit of audit as per our trust guidelines.
12. In the footnotes the data sharing statement has been expanded. The data is available but only once anonymized in accordance with the data protection act.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sameer Khan Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust Northumbria House Silver Fox Way Cobalt Business Park North Shields NE27 0QJ
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Oct-2016
GENERAL COMMENTS	Happy with the revision. Suggest to accept for publication.