

Answers to comments from reviewer:

1 Methods. The numbers of eligible, excluded, enrolled, etc should be moved to Results.

Answer: the numbers regarding patient selection has been moved to results. A description of the selection process remains in the method section.

2 It is not clear whether clinical follow-up at 1 year was conducted independently of survey results.

Answer: : it has been specified that the clinical follow up was conducted as usual and separately from this survey.

3 Although it is likely that experienced surgeons at a single specialized center performing the same operation would have similar outcomes, for a scientific study assessing surgical outcomes it would be important to confirm this with data.

Answer: We are not sure what the reviewer means by this question. As we are primarily investigating preoperative factors, the surgeons expertise should not play any significant role. External validity of our results is discussed in the discussion: page 11, section 2.

4 As noted in Introduction, certain medical comorbidities and mental health diseases are associated with clinical outcomes. What comorbidities were assessed for this study?

-a list of the assessed co-morbidities has been added to the method section.

5 "we registered concurrent post-OP symptoms and self-reported QoL were registered": was this all in the same mailed/emailed survey? Results

-We assume that the quote is from the "patients and methods" section of materials and methods as we can not recognize this in the result section.

Post-op symptoms and QoL was registered based on a 1-year post-OP questionnaire. Separate from the initial questionnaire distributed pre-operatively. The text has been adjusted to clarify.

6 Could you please explain what test was used for the P values presented? This seems to be a multivariable analysis with adjusted P values, but it is unclear from the Statistics section how it was done. Discussion

Answer: The statistical method is described in detail in the methods section:

*"Test for association of minority ethnicity with interest variables was done by t-test or for non-normal distributed variables by Wilcoxon sum rank test for continues variables and chi-square or, in cases with expected values below 5, Fishers exact test for categorical variables. Associations between education duration groups and the interest variables was done for continues variables by uni-variable linear regression with TYPE III test or Kruskal-Wallis sum rank test for non-normal distributed variables and for categorical variables chi-square and Fishers exact test. Additionally, to adjust for multiple testing a Bonferroni correction was done for all p-values, the correction scale was given by the number of tests performed within each outcome group listed in the results table. The adjusted p-value was calculated by multiplying the original p-values by the given scale".*

7 Regression analysis is mentioned on page 11, but not described in Methods nor Results. Tables 2 & 3 8 Judging by Table 3, the P values seem to be presented as univariate (adjusted multivariate regression). Why are some of the adjusted P values above 1 (BMI, QoL, Level of symptoms before surgery, Difference in level of symptoms, etc)?

Regression analysis was used to analysis the association between education levels and the interest variables, since education has more than two levels t-test and Wilcoxon sum rank test cannot be used. Instead we used a linear regression model with an single independent variable, education level, this is referred to as the univariate (single independent variable) regression in the method section.

Regarding the p-values, Bonferroni correction was used to account for multiple testing, this can be done by either scaling down the significance level of 0.05 accordingly to the number of test performed, or equivalently scaling up the p-value and evaluating the new p-value with regards to a significant level of 0.05. We believe it easier for the reader to comprehend the new p-value with regards to the traditional boundaries.

However if this is this is unsatisfactory labelling with scale significant levels and unadjusted p-values can be provided.

Figure 9 Please remove the shadow effect. It unnecessarily clutters the view.

-The shadow effect has been removed.