

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)	Interventions to improve the self-management support health professionals provide for people with progressive neurological conditions: Protocol for a realist synthesis
AUTHORS	Davies, Freya; Wood, Fiona; Bullock, Alison; Wallace, Carolyn; Edwards, Adrian

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Kristen Pitzul University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Oct-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors describe a gap in the literature that is quite complex and would be nicely served by a realist review. They have also appropriately described their study protocol. I have outlined a few minor revisions below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On page 3, para1 line 16: It would help non-clinical readers if a clear definition of progressive neurological conditions (PNCs) was provided (the authors provide two examples but no clear definition is provided until appendix 2). 2. On page 3, para2 lines 32-37: I am having a difficult time grasping the connection between selection bias into SMS programs (lines 32-34) and the support required for effective SMS programs (lines 37). Please revise this paragraph to clarify your thought process between these two statements. 3. On page 4, para 2, lines 8-9: Please fix grammatical errors. 4. Page 5, para1, lines 4-5: I would change "operate differently when delivered into different settings" to "operate differently when delivered in different contexts" (or provide a definition for what you mean by settings, as in my opinion there can be multiple contexts within 1 setting). 5. On page 6, para 2, lines 21-26: Please briefly describe your sampling strategy for key informants. Are these the same as your stakeholders mentioned on page 6, para 4? Also, will study authors be contacted for further information if published study data doesn't sufficiently describe their program? 6. On page 7, para 4, lines 51-52: I would recommend to the authors that they record the exact dates searches were performed in the future (as opposed to a month long span). Please include (perhaps in your supplementary files) if available for searches already
-------------------------	---

	<p>performed.</p> <p>7. On page 8, lines 22-24: the authors describe how papers not specific to PNCs will be ranked lower, however their first RQ (stated on page 7) isn't PNC-specific. Please clarify.</p> <p>8. On page 13, line 10: Please fix typo.</p> <p>I would like to thank the authors for the nicely written protocol and I look forward to reading the results of their work.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Fiona Jones St Georges University of London and Kingston University, United Kingdom.
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Nov-2016

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors have presented a clear protocol for a realist synthesis of self-management support programmes for people living with neurological conditions. I have read through the protocol and can find minimal issues that require correction.</p> <p>I would only ask that the authors make a clear statement to clarify if the review is focusing on CMOs of self-management support interventions for people with neurological conditions, or the training and delivery of programmes by healthcare professionals, or is focusing on both these areas. I think I know the answer but had to read a few times for clarity.</p> <p>Otherwise I have no further comments.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

1. On page 3, para1 line 16: It would help non-clinical readers if a clear definition of progressive neurological conditions (PNCs) was provided (the authors provide two examples but no clear definition is provided until appendix 2).

We have added the definition:

“PNCs are conditions in which patients experience a progressive deterioration in their functioning (for example Parkinson’s disease and Multiple Sclerosis)”

In addition we have also clarified why dementia is not included in our definition

“Although dementia could be classified as a PNC, people with dementia are usually managed by a different healthcare team (old age psychiatry) to people with other PNCs, so for the purpose of this review we have not included dementia. within our definition of PNCs(27)”

2. On page 3, para2 lines 32-37: I am having a difficult time grasping the connection between selection bias into SMS programs (lines 32-34) and the support required for effective SMS programs (lines 37). Please revise this paragraph to clarify your thought process between these two statements. This paragraph has been revised for clarification.

3. On page 4, para 2, lines 8-9: Please fix grammatical errors. This paragraph has been revised.

4. Page 5, para1, lines 4-5: I would change "operate differently when delivered into different settings" to "operate differently when delivered in different contexts" (or provide a definition for what you mean by settings, as in my opinion there can be multiple contexts within 1 setting).
We agree, and have changed the wording of this as suggested.

5. On page 6, para 2, lines 21-26: Please briefly describe your sampling strategy for key informants. Are these the same as your stakeholders mentioned on page 6, para 4? Also, will study authors be contacted for further information if published study data doesn't sufficiently describe their program? We have clarified this by adding the line:

"We will use a convenience sample of contacts made by the stakeholder group from a range of different training backgrounds"

Due to time and resource constraints we do not plan to contact study authors. We recognise this as a potential limitation and will report on this when we publish the results.

6. On page 7, para 4, lines 51-52: I would recommend to the authors that they record the exact dates searches were performed in the future (as opposed to a month long span). Please include (perhaps in your supplementary files) if available for searches already performed.
The original appendices have now been changed to supplementary files.

Supplementary file one now contains details of all of the initial search run in each database with dates.

7. On page 8, lines 22-24: the authors describe how papers not specific to PNCs will be ranked lower, however their first RQ (stated on page 7) isn't PNC-specific. Please clarify.

We have amended the wording of the first research question to clarify that the focus of the review is progressive neurological conditions.

"1. What is the influence of a shared concept of SMS within healthcare teams caring for people with progressive neurological conditions and how can it be achieved?"

8. On page 13, line 10: Please fix typo.

Corrected. Thank you.

Reviewer 2

I would only ask that the authors make a clear statement to clarify if the review is focusing on CMOs of self-management support interventions for people with neurological conditions, or the training and delivery of programmes by healthcare professionals, or is focusing on both these areas. I think I know the answer but had to read a few times for clarity.

We have added this statement to the main text:

"During this review we will focus specifically on understanding how training in SMS and delivery of support operates at the level of the health professional, rather than at the level of the patient."

The abstract has also been revised for further clarification.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Kristen Pitzul University of Toronto, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	29-Nov-2016
GENERAL COMMENTS	I would like to thank the authors for addressing all of my previous concerns.