

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)	Telehealth use in Primary Health Care collaborative interprofessional practice: protocol for a scoping review
AUTHORS	Belber, Gisele; Vasconcelos, Raíssa; Agreli, Heloise; Haddad, Ana Estela; Peduzzi, Marina; Leonello, Valéria Marli

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Breton, Mylaine University of Sherbrooke, Community Health
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Nov-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Scoping – Telehealth use in PHC care collaborative interprofessional practice</p> <p>Introduction Very well written. The relevance of the study is well presented and justified. The concept of interprofessional collaborations could be defined. What are the major scientific writings on interprofessional collaboration? How the authors define « the characteristics” related to the use of telehealth in the context of interprofessional collaboration? How to describe the characteristics related to the telehealth concept? How to describe the characteristics related to interprofessional collaboration</p> <p>Methods Very well detailed. The authors present all the important information to conduct a scoping review. Strategy for data synthesis The authors could specify the information related to the theme under study and the research question « describing how the results on xxx – are related to the purpose of the review and the research question on xxx</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Shoemaker, Margrit Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Nov-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for tackling this needed scoping review.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1, Dr. Mylaine Breton comment: Methods: very well detailed. The authors present all the important information to conduct a scoping review. Strategy for data synthesis: the authors could specify the information related to the theme under study and the research question « describing how the results on xxx – are related to the purpose of the review and the research question on xxx.

Authors' response: We rewrote part of the paragraph in the “Strategy for data synthesis” section, as suggested.

Reviewer 2, Margrit Shoemaker comment: thank you for tackling this needed scoping review.

Authors' response: Thank you very much. We appreciate your interest in our paper.

Sincerely,

MSc and PhD Student Gisele Silvestre Belber and Professor Valéria Marli Leonello