

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Sing Your Lungs Out: A qualitative study of a community singing group for people with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD).
AUTHORS	McNaughton, Amanda; Aldington, Sarah; Williams, Gayle; Levack, William

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Carly Reagon School of Healthcare Sciences Cardiff University Cardiff Wales, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	25-May-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a well written research paper which contributes to an emerging and important field of research. Overall the methodology is very clear and the results informative and detailed. The implications for patient well being are potentially very significant. My suggestions for revision are minor and as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be useful to have more detail on recruitment e.g. did this occur face to face, via adverts etc.? - Participants were invited to comment on transcripts. Did this result in any changes to the data? - Interviewers were also involved in running the choir - did this alter data collection in any way (either positively e.g. in building rapport, or negatively e.g. influencing responses)? - Discussion occurred after the 13th interview - however there were only 12 interviewees. It would be useful to clarify this: were interviewees interviewed more than once? - Were the focus groups analysed in the same way as the interviews? Were there any noticeable differences between the data derived from both methods? - In the discussion it would be useful to link themes such as sense of belonging and purpose to the wider literature on singing and quality of life/wellbeing, thus demonstrating the wider transferability of the study.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Jennifer J Nicol University of Saskatchewan Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Jun-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1	Comment	Response	Changes made to text
1.	It would be useful to have more detail on recruitment e.g. did this occur face to face, via adverts etc.?	Face to face	P6 L17 Sentence modified
2.	Participants were invited to comment on transcripts. Did this result in any changes to the data?	Participants were given the opportunity to review their interview transcripts. This did not result in any changes to the data.	P7 L46
3.	Interviewers were also involved in running the choir - did this alter data collection in any way (either positively e.g. in building rapport, or negatively e.g. influencing responses)?	This is addressed in the discussion P16 L43-49	
4.	Discussion occurred after the 13th interview - however there were only 12 interviewees. It would be useful to clarify this: were interviewees interviewed more than once?	The reviewer is correct there were 12 individual interviews and 1 focus group	P8 L15 Thirteenth changed to <i>twelfth</i>
5.	Were the focus groups analysed in the same way as the interviews? Were there any noticeable differences between the data derived from both methods?	Yes, with no noticeable difference	P8 L20
6.	In the discussion it would be useful to link themes such as sense of belonging and purpose to the wider literature on singing and quality of life/wellbeing, thus demonstrating the wider transferability of the study.	Reference added	P 17 discussion para4
Reviewer #2			
1.	P5 L3	Refers to NZ	In NZ
2	P5 L52	expanded	Based on grounded theory
3.	P6 L33		Amateur singer
4	P6 L35	observer	Sentence modified
5	P6 L37		Sentence modified
6	P6 L46		Sentence modified
7	P7 L9		Sentence modified
8	P7 L15		<i>Semi-structured</i> added
9	P7 L38		<i>Perceived</i> added
10	P8 L9	Transcripts coded independently	Sentence modified
11	P8 L30	Five early drop outs from original 28	Clarified
12	P8 L47		Corrected

			N
13	P9 L3	Collected as part of mixed methods study	Clarified P7 Under data collection para 2
14	P9 L23		<i>Perceived</i> added
15	P9 L37	Relationship discussed in Discussion section, para 1	Sentence and reference to Fig 1 deleted
16	P13 L31	Reviewer's point taken.	Sentence modified and reference added
17	P14 L3		Sentence modified
18	P15 L11		<i>Perceived</i> added
19	P16 L18	Agree with reviewer that figure not required	Figure 1, and references to it deleted
20	P16 L35		Explained para 1 of results section
21	P16 L40	Have added direct reference to Lord 2012 comparing SG to film club	P 17
22	P17 L9		Sentence modified
23	P17 L48		Sentence modified
24	P18 L3	Explained Third Space concept in more detail p18, para1	Sentence modified
25	P18 L37		<i>Perceived</i> added