Quality of Patient Reviewer Comments
Coding scheme examples

Category 1 Codes – Type of Patient Reviewer Comment	
Code	**Examples**
1 Specific constructive criticism or specific request for clarification	It may help if you focus less on the main study in the background section and introduce the idea of the supplemental tele-health study discussed in this paper earlier.
2 Non-specific criticism or non-specific request for clarification	I find the background section in the abstract confusing.
3 Praise/positive comment	They provide quite detailed information about their Patient Advisory Board's activities, and how these influenced intervention design and materials.
4 Neutral observation, summary, or grammatical change	The researchers felt that introducing a tracheostomy procedure sooner rather than later would lead to a better health outcome.
Category 2 Codes – Focus on Patient Engagement and Patient Centeredness	
Code	**Examples**
0 Does not refer to patient and stakeholder centeredness	The authors did explain the numerous limitations imposed on the study due to incomplete, absent data as well as resource and time constraints.
1 Refers to patient and stakeholder engagement	Additional information regarding how these same groups [referring to study advisory groups] were involved in implementation and dissemination of the findings would benefit this report.
2 All other references to patient centeredness	I believe that the intervention is feasible provided that the patient has ongoing and close supervision of a physician or clinician.

Patient Reviewer Comments and Level of Author and Editor Responses

KGL KnowledgeWorks Global Ltd. CJK GROUP

pcori

Total Number of Patient Reviewer Comments = 1317

- Number of individual comments or sentences.
- Each coded for Category 1 and Category 2.
- Category 1 recalculated on binary scale (1 vs 2, 3 or 4)
- Category 2 recalculated on binary scale (1 or 2 vs. 0)
- Chi-square test for relationship between Category 1 and Category 2 codes.

Total Number of Paragraphs of Reviewer Comments = 450

- Author responses counted at this level.
- Author Code 1 = any substantive response to comments in the paragraph (with or without change to report).
- Author Code 0 = no response or perfunctory (i.e., "thank you").
- Patient reviewer Category 1 and Category 2 binary codes based on most common code (≥ 50%) for that paragraph.
- Odds ratios based on likelihood of author response when patient reviewer binary code = 1

Total Number of Patient Reviews = 59

- Editor mentions counted at this level.
- Editor Code 1 = any positive mention of patient reviewer's comments.
- Editor Code 0 = no mention of patient reviewer's comments or discourages author response to comments.
- Odds ratios based on likelihood of editor mention for each 10% increase in patient reviewer binary code 1 comments

Patient Reviewer, Author, and Editor Summary Data

Metric	Measurement
Number of Clinical Trial Reports	53
Number of Patient Reviews	59 (4 reports had 2 reviews and 1 report had 3 reviews)
Total number of comments	1317
Total number of paragraphs	450
Number of Reviewer Comments per Patient Review	16 (21.5) Median (IQR) 22.3 (22.8) Mean (SD)
Number of Author Responses per Patient Review	5 (5.5) Median (IQR) 7.5 (5.5) Mean (SD)
Percent of Patient Reviews Mentioned Positively by the Editor	40.68%

Patient Review Comment by Author and Editor Response

Paragraphs within Patient Reviews (N=450)	Author Comments by Paragraph, N (%)	Proportion of Patient Review Paragraphs with Specific Criticisms, % (se)	Proportion of Patient Review Paragraphs with Patient-focused Elements , % (se)
Author Comments or Changes Report	240 (53.33%)	35.86% (2.34%)	47.81% (2.44%)
Author does not Respond	210 (46.67%)	14.83% (2.04%)	49.48% (2.63%)
Patient Reviews (N=59)	**Editor Comments by Review, N (%)**	**Proportion of Patient Reviews with Specific Criticisms, % (se)**	**Proportion of Patient Review Paragraphs with Patient-focused Elements, % (se)**
Editor Specifically mentions Patient Review Positively	24 (40.68%)	27.63% (4.38%)	52.88% (2.68%)
Editor Does not Mention Patient Review Specifically (n=34) or Discourages Response to Patient Review Comment (n=1)	35 (59.32%)	25.66% (3.77%)	43.38% (3.73%)

Weighted Regression Results for Both Categories, PI and AE responses

	Weighted Percent of patient review code 1 vs patient review code 0 Mean (se)[3]	Odds Ratio Estimate	95% Confidence Intervals	P value
Editor mentions positively, Category 1 (N = 59 reviews)[1]	27.63% (4.38%) vs 25.66% (3.77%)	1.15	0.92–1.43	0.23
Author responds, Category 1 (N = 450 paragraphs)[2]	35.86% (2.34%) vs 14.83% (2.04)	11.60	7.05–19.09	<0.0001
Editor mentions positively, Category 2 (N = 59 reviews)[1]	52.88 % (2.68%) vs 43.38% (3.73%)	1.36	1.27–1.45	< 0.0001
Author responds, Category 2 (N = 450 paragraphs)[2]	47.81% (2.44%) vs 49.48% (2.63%)	0.77	0.57–1.04	0.08

[1] Editor percentages weighted by 1317 total comments across 59 reviews.
[2] Author percentages weighted by 1317 total comments across 450 total paragraphs.
[3] For category 1, code 1 = specific and constructive comment, code 0 = all other comments. For category 2, code 1 = patient centeredness or patient engagement comment vs. code 0 = not patient-focused comment.