

6-Jan-2017

Dear Mrs. Foskett-Tharby

BMJ.2016.034749 entitled "Incentivising patient centred coordinated care: challenges and pitfalls"

Thank you for sending us your article, which we read with interest, and for your patience while we have been considering it.

We sent it out for external peer review again and discussed it at the Analysis manuscript committee meeting (present: Bishal Gyawali, Navjoyt Ladher, Stephen Leeder, Emma Rourke, Rosamund Snow).

Unfortunately we do not consider it suitable for publication in its present form.

However if you are able to amend it in the light of our and/or reviewers' comments, we would be happy to consider it again.

Please note that resubmitting your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance, and that your resubmission may be sent again for review.

The reviewers' comments are at the end of this letter. The editors comments are listed below:

- 1) Editors thought that your paper covered a relevant and interesting topic. We liked the line of questioning, but felt that the paper could go further in using the patient perspective to challenge QOF and pay-for-performance other healthcare systems. The comments here are intended to strengthen the manuscript and its potential influence.
- 2) We agree with reviewer Angela Coulter's point that the article enumerates a lot of problems but doesn't present any solutions beyond calling for more research. Looking to other healthcare systems or indeed the gaming literature in other industries, are there any potential solutions or future directions that can be pursued?
- 3) Editors also thought the issues around acting on findings to make quality improvements could be stronger and more direct (building on a recent Analysis on patient participation groups in general practice <http://www.bmj.com/content/352/bmj.i673> and accompanying commentary <http://www.bmj.com/content/352/bmj.i913>)
- 4) One question that is not addressed in the manuscript is the question of whether care should be incentivised at all, and if it is, who should decide what priorities and outcomes are incentivised? To what extent should patients be involved with this?
- 5) We look for Analysis articles to be relevant internationally and were interested in the international context. Is this taking place elsewhere? How might it be relevant to other healthcare systems outside of QOF?