

16 June 2021,

Dear editors of Word Journal of Orthopedics,

We would like to thank you for the conditional acceptance of our manuscript for publication in World Journal of Orthopedics. We would also like to thank the reviewers and editors for taking the time to review our manuscript. Below, you find a point-by-point response to the issues raised by the reviewers.

We look forward to hearing from you,

Kind regards,

Lode van Dijk

On behalf of the coauthors

Tergooi Ziekenhuis  
Department of Orthopedic Surgery  
van Riebeeckweg 212, 1213 XZ Hilversum  
The Netherlands.

## **Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:**

### **Reviewer: 1**

Specific Comments to Authors: This appears to be a well conceived and well conducted RCT. The authors were unfortunate to experience a considerable drop-out till the end of the trial (26 weeks), however, they correctly refrained from making any inference based on the 26-week data.

**Comment:** I have only one minor comment: Formal statistical test for comparisons of randomized patients at baseline are unnecessary and actually a poor practice - this should not be done. Explanation can be found in the Consort Statement <http://www.consort-statement.org/checklists/view/32--consort-2010/510-baseline-data>

**Response:** Thank you for this comment. We have read the explanation on <http://www.consort-statement.org/checklists/view/32--consort-2010/510-baseline-data>. We agree with this comment and we have removed the statistical test for comparison of the randomized patients.

### **Science editor:**

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a randomized controlled trial of the influence of decision aids on decisional conflict in patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis. The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This appears to be a well conceived and well conducted RCT. The authors were unfortunate to experience a considerable drop-out till the end of the trial (26 weeks), however, they correctly refrained from making any inference based on the 26-week data. The questions raised by the reviewer should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 1 figure. (4) References: A total of 19 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the CONSORT 2010 Statement and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO; 5 Issues raised:

**(1) Comment:** The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words

**(1) Response:** Thank you for your comment. We have shortened the title to 16 words:

Decision aids can decrease decisional conflict in patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis: Randomized controlled trial

**(2) Comment:** The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

**(2) Response:** We added an “Author Contributions” section:

**Author contributions:** RW Poolman and D Haverkamp were responsible for the study design. RW Poolman, D Haverkamp and AMSJ Vervest were involved in including patients in the study. LA van Dijk, AMSJ Vervest and DC Baas wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript before submission.

**(3) Comment:** The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

**(3) Response:** We added figure 1 as a PowerPoint document.

**(4) Comment:** The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

**(4) Response:** We added an “Article Highlights” section:

*Research background*

Shared decision making is becoming more popular over the years. With diagnoses where there is more than one reasonable treatment option a decision aid (DA) can help the patient and the physician with the shared decision-making process.

*Research motivation*

To investigate if DA's can help in optimizing orthopedic healthcare we provide to patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis (OA).

*Research objectives*

The objective of this study was to determine the influence of a DA on decisional conflict in patients that need treatment for hip or knee OA.

*Research methods*

A multi-center unblinded randomized controlled trial in which we compared decisional conflict in patients with hip or knee OA. The control group was treated with standard care, the intervention group was treated with standard care and was provided with a DA.

*Research results*

In the intervention group we observed a significant decrease in decisional conflict after their first consultation with the physician. At 26 weeks the sample was too small for analysis because of the excessive loss to follow-up.

#### *Research conclusions*

Patients with hip or knee osteoarthritis choosing a treatment seem to have less decisional conflict after their first consultation with their physician when treated with an additional DA.

#### *Research perspectives*

In further research we should investigate the cost-effectiveness of decision aids and the satisfaction among physicians.