

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jtd-23-112>

### Reviewer A

Comment 1: Could the authors please check the abstract regarding punctuation

Reply: We have made changes to the abstract between line 43-57 to make the abstract clearer and correct any punctuation errors.

Changes in the text: Line 43-57

Comment 2: The authors claim that all patients from a large centre between 2018-2022 had been included in the analysis – however, the total numbers do not reflect this activity (as Kings Health Partners operates on several hundred patients each year). Could they please add a comment to the manuscript acknowledging that there were many more patients who were referred for screening but may have been screened remotely (e.g. home based sleep study)

Reply: We have added an extra line in patient and methods to make it clear that patients underwent home screening sleep study and that only patients with abnormal results were referred for review and included in our study

Changes in the text: Line 131-136

Comment 3: Presentation of the results: is the pie chart the best presentation for this type of data (adherence)?

Reply: We were not interested in adherence per se but the proportion of patients who met the traditional cut-off criteria for compliance of 4 hours (and also the more stringent criteria of 6 hours) as well as proportion of patients who did not actually turn their machine on to trial CPAP. We felt the pie chart was the best representation for this proportional data.

Changes in the text: No change

### Reviewer B

Comment 1: Please provide column headings for the first columns of Table 1 to Table 3, respectively.

4)

Reply: Changes made as requested.

Comment 2: Suggested changes for tables:

Sex (%females) ⇒ Sex, females (%)

kg/m2 ⇒ kg/m<sup>2</sup>

SpO2 ⇒ SpO<sub>2</sub>

pO2 ⇒ pO<sub>2</sub>

pCO2 ⇒ pCO<sub>2</sub>

FEV1 ⇒ FEV<sub>1</sub>

Reply: Changes made as requested.