

Dear editorial team.

Many thanks for inviting us to submit a narrative minireview on our field of expertise. We believe an article reviewing the increasingly relevant role of technology in patient reported outcomes data is warranted and timely and we are grateful for the opportunity to work with you to achieve this.

We appreciate these comments on our initially submitted article and the opportunity to revise our paper. We are very happy to engage with criticism, and do so where we can, but we find some of the suggestions in these reviews extremely puzzling – particularly those that suggest we should change the structure of the article. Structurally we believe we are very much in accordance with other minireviews you have published, and indeed your article guidelines. As such, we enclose our revised manuscript addressing what comments we can, but please note that we have not amended the basic text or structure.

We have responded to the reviewers below as far as we are able. Of note two of them suggested this illogical change in structure that we contest. In general response, reviewer-1 offered a very poor technical review that was hard to engage with at all, reviewer-2 made the same error as to structure, but made some helpful suggestions, and reviewer-3 required no response.

We very much hope to be able to publish this article in WJO but are not prepared to make structural changes that would weaken the paper. We will happily engage in further discussion as to this with the editorial team.

Best wishes

David Hamilton, Johannes Giesinger and Karlmeinrad Giesinger

Editorial office's comments: Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: This is a minireview of the using PROMs in clinical practice. The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Grade A, Grade C and Grade D; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Very useful and excellent study. However, there are some issues should be addressed. Structurally article as introduction, Methods, results, and Discussion should be amended and revised. The title should point out the advantages of evaluating PROMs via electronic media explicitly. There is no real discussion. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 3 figures. A total of 75 references are cited, including 6 references published in the last 3 years. There are 8 self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A, Grade B and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 8%. According to our policy, the overall similarity index should be less than 30%, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions; (2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (4) the author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report and the full text of the manuscript, of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revision. Before final acceptance, the authors need to meet publishing requirement by submitting correct documents which listed by the editors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements. Re-Review: Required.

Authors: many thanks for this feedback. Responding to your comments in sequence.

As you note this is an invited minireview and we are really quite confused by the suggestion to change the format to that of introduction/methods/results/discussion. Clearly this structure does not fit this sort of narrative review paper – and is not employed in any of your previously published minireviews. We have not made any changes here as we believe this comment must have been made in error. As far as we can tell, we have complied with the editorial guidelines of the minireview and we are in structural accordance with previous reviews that you have published; <https://www.wjnet.com/2218-5836/full/v11/i7/319.htm>

We would prefer not to change the title as explicitly stating the advantages of electronic data capture in the title would not accurately reflect the content of the article – which is about the general use of such metrics as opposed to the praising of ePRO. Other minireview titles you have recently published are not explicit in this manner (e.g. “Current concepts in the surgical treatment of skeletal metastases”). We hope this is OK.

We are also very confused by the suggestion that there is no discussion. There is no specific discussion section, but the whole article is a discussion piece as a narrative minireview. We have not made any structural changes to the article. We have a short conclusion as per previous mini reviews you have published.

A point-by-point response to the reviewer comments follows below. Please note that we found the reviews difficult to respond to as the criticism seemed to essentially be that this was a narrative minireview article. The reviewers seemed to want us to restructure into a standard article format – which, as we have noted above, is not neither logical nor possible. Reviewer 1 was particularly disappointing from a technical review perspective. We are happy to engage with constructive criticism to improve our paper, but unfortunately no sensible critique was offered as to the content of the article by this reviewer. With our editorial board hats on we would not be inclined to invite this reviewer to comment on any further articles.

We apologise for not supplying editable original figures with the original submission – new power point versions are enclosed with the revised document set, identified with the reference number you supplied.

Unfortunately, you have not shared the results of the CrossCheck report with us. As such we cannot usefully respond to the comment as to over-use of a single source. We are not aware of unusually using a single document in our review, and it is not obvious to us which the specific offending article was. If you highlight to us which parts of the manuscript you would like us to revisit, we will be happy to do so.

We have updated the reference list as per your request, with PMID and DOI details and have checked to ensure all authors are listed. We have also now revised the notation of the references in the manuscript as requested to square brackets in superscript.

We hope that our revised submission now meets all the publishing standards.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: 1. The title should point out the advantages of evaluating PROMs via electronic media explicitly 2. The abstract outlines the topic quite well. 3. The keywords don't really correlate with the content, only in part. 4. The Background is evident and is common knowledge, so no extensive background explanation are required. this part of the text should be shortened 5. No method is described. 6. There are no results reported. 7. There is no real discussion. The entire text is more or less a philosophical discussion of digital data collection via electronic media. I miss that the advantages are contrasted with the disadvantages in a clearer structure. The message of the paper is not clearly visible. The recommendation to use electronic media is a development which offers many advantages and which is already widely used. Recommendations on how to use electronic media should be presented in more detail and more specifically. The paper should be written in a more simple language, especially fewer nested sentences.

Authors:

Thank you for your comments. Unfortunately, you do not seem to have appreciated that this submission is a narrative review. Your comments don't make much sense and we generally disagree, thus have made few changes in response.

1. We do not think it appropriate to change the title – we think it summarises the content of our review rather well. Your suggestion would not reflect the content of the article.

2. Thank you.

3. We think the keywords really are the correct ones. Though we have added 'ePRO' as another useful searchable term

4. Yes, indeed, the background is a summary of what is known. It is about half a page long – typical of most articles.

5 and 6. This is an extremely strange comment. You must surely appreciate from reading the paper that this is a narrative review - and as such does not have a method/results structure. We assume this must be a comment in error and that you are not consciously suggesting we should somehow try to manhandle our narrative review into the structure of a primary research paper?

7. Indeed the whole piece is a discussion – it is a narrative review. The topic is not traditional versus electronic data, but specifically of the role of and the use of electronic PROMs. We are sorry that you have missed the message, but on re-reading we think it somewhat obvious - see below (from our abstract).

This review evaluates the role of patient reported outcomes data as a tool to enhance daily orthopaedic clinical practice, and documents how developments in electronic outcome measures, computer adaptive questionnaire design and instant graphical display of questionnaire can facilitate enhanced patient-clinician shared decision making.

To reiterate, this is not about digital data capture, but the emerging field of electronic patient reported outcome measures. We are not making recommendations, but rather reviewing the emerging field.

As experienced authors and native English speakers we are quite content with the language. We have not made any specific changes in response to your generic comment. Your language suggestions may have carried more weight were they to have been detailed in more coherent prose, correctly punctuated, and with fewer spelling errors.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: World Journal of Orthopedics 18 July 2020 Manuscript ID:

Reviewer's Code: 02953796 " Technological developments enable measuring and using patient-reported outcomes data in orthopaedic clinical practice"

Dear editorial Teams This is well design article . However, I have several suggestions that I think would improve the quality of research: a) The aim of study well is not stated? b) Structurally article as introduction, Methods, results, and Discussion should be amended and revised. c) Limitations of study is not stated? d) Standardization of tools in ePROM is not discussed? e) Prediction in ePROM database is not assessed for clinical practice? f) Explain and discuss what the research adds to what is already known? Parisa Azimi, MD,

Authors:

Thank you for your comments and suggestions.

a. For this invited narrative review, we have not explicitly added a research aim but rather an agenda for the commentary article.

This review evaluates the role of patient reported outcomes data as a tool to enhance daily orthopaedic clinical practice, and documents how developments in electronic outcome measures, computer adaptive questionnaire design and instant graphical display of questionnaire can facilitate enhanced patient-clinician shared decision making.

b. This is an invited narrative review – the structure you suggest is inappropriate for this, and unfortunately, we cannot engage with this suggestion.

c. Again this comment seems out of place for the article type submitted. It is not a research study but a commentary – as such there is no discussion of our method.

d. Thank you. The use of well-standardized PROMs for outcome assessment has become common practice in the orthopaedic field, with the only major exception being the assessment of patient satisfaction that still frequently relies on ad-hoc formulated questions and response categories that differ across studies and compromise comparability of study results. This means, the available PROMs have a very high level of standardization (in terms of introduction texts explaining the measured concepts and how to complete the questionnaire, item text, response categories, and scoring algorithms), but a few areas of research remain that do not rely on PROMs but ad-hoc questions.

e. Thank you. If we understand correctly, you are pointing to the use of routinely collected data for prognosis of treatment outcome of individual patients undergoing treatment. Unlike paper-pencil assessments, electronic data capture provides immediate availability of all collected data in a database that may be used for establishing and constant updating of regression model that allow for a prognosis of treatment outcome for individual patients based on baseline PRO assessments and patient characteristics. We have now included some comments as to this aspect in our manuscript.

f. Again, this is a review, we are not adding to the research base but summarising it. We hope that the content of the entire article achieves this.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Excellent review.

Authors:

many thanks for your comments