



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Methodology*

**Manuscript NO:** 98066

**Title:** Voices that Matter: The Impact of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures on Clinical Decision-Making

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 08262676

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Reviewer\_Country

**Author’s Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2024-06-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Lin Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2024-08-25 17:18

**Reviewer performed review:** 2024-08-28 16:17

**Review time:** 2 Days and 22 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Novelty of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation



<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

(1)Is the manuscript important/innovative and why? In particular, does it contain new concepts, hypotheses, and/or mechanistic, diagnostic or therapeutic information, or does it represent a state-of-the-art review of the topic? The article is innovative and acceptable from the patient's point of view, giving appropriate feedback to the healthcare provider's treatment and care program and adjusting the implementation of the program accordingly, in order to make the patient better accept the treatment and care program assigned by the healthcare provider, thus achieving both physical and psychological satisfaction. (2)Is the manuscript well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented? The article is logically rigorous, with concise and coherent language. 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes, the title succinctly and accurately reflects the main idea the essay is trying to convey. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes. The keywords reflect the focus of the article in terms of its main idea and the three aspects of data management and policy development covered. 4 Background. Does the manuscript



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes. The context of the article is from the patient's point of view, describing the benefits that PROMs provide and what needs to be explored in depth in the future. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The article belongs to a small evaluation type of study and there is no research methodology. However, the article provides a well-organized and complete description of PROMs in terms of definition, types, development and validation, benefits in healthcare, challenges in implementing PROMs, and future directions. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The article is critical and there are no research findings. 7 Discussion. The article fully discusses the meaning and benefits of PROMs, and expresses its challenges and future directions in a well-organized manner. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? The images and tables are clear and logical. Tables are clearly categorized and articulated, and schematics adequately and accurately reflect the images shown. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? There are no statistically relevant elements. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Since the article is critical, more up-to-date articles are needed in the essay to justify the research argument. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes. 13 Research methods and reporting. The authors wrote the manuscript appropriately and articulated that PROMs could be integrated with other types of health data in the future when clear guidelines are



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** office@baishideng.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

developed, and that validity in different populations also needs to be explored. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? No ethical proof is required.