

BMJ - Decision on
Manuscript ID
BMJ.2018.043530.R
2

Body:

11-Jun-2018

Dear Mr. Palmer,

Manuscript ID BMJ.2018.043530.R2 entitled "Arthroscopic Hip Surgery compared with Physiotherapy and Activity Modification for the Treatment of Symptomatic Femoroacetabular Impingement: A Multi-Centre Randomised Controlled Trial"

Thank you for sending us your revised paper. I've sent it back to our statistician, Professor Riley, and we continue to have some concerns. We hope you will be able to fully address these in a revision so that we can move ahead with the paper.

In some ways the "response to comments" document more fully addresses our comments than does the revised paper.

In particular, the minimally important clinical difference remains a tension in the paper. We think you need to draw more attention to the wide confidence intervals. In the abstract, for example, you specifically say that the result is above the minimal difference, even though the lower CI value is well below the minimal value.

I'm afraid that we also feel that if subgroup analysis is genuinely important you must do it properly. We do not think that the arbitrary categorization of age at 40 years is justified.

Better description and reporting of the missing data imputation is also needed.

We look forward to seeing a version of the paper that addresses these matters.

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Loder, MD, MPH
eloder@bmj.com

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj?URL_MASK=e6d2933b49734b4f95c5f8e3488b0145

Report from The BMJ's manuscript committee meeting

These comments are an attempt to summarise the discussions at the manuscript meeting. They are not an exact transcript.

Members of the committee were: xxx (chair), yyy (statistician), [and list other eds who took part]

Decision: Put points

Detailed comments from the meeting:

First, please revise your paper to respond to all of the comments by the reviewers. Their reports are available at the end of this letter, below.

Please also respond to these additional comments by the committee:

*
*
*
*

In your response please provide, point by point, your replies to the comments made by the reviewers and the editors, explaining how you have dealt with them in the paper.

** Comments from the external peer reviewers**