

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Protocol for A Scoping Review of the Landscape of Métis Health and Wellness
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Boutros, Helana Marie; Koprach, Sabastian; Simms, Abigail; Tsui, Noel; Boyle, Rose-Anne; Harrison, Jen; Riddell, Melissa; Sanftenberg, Santana; Cripps, Shelley; Edwards, Sarah; MNO, Métis Nation of Ontario

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Foulds, Heather Usask
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	13-Oct-2023

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is an interesting protocol and an important step in understanding Indigenous health experiences. Métis People are significantly underrepresented in research and literature. Further, this project will be led by the Métis Nation of Ontario, one of the Métis governing bodies in Canada. Despite the requirement of Indigenous community engagement in research involving Indigenous Peoples in Canada, including secondary uses of information such as literature reviews (TCPS 2 – Chapter 9, Article 9.1 (e)), many literature reviews do not incorporate Indigenous community partners. This project takes this engagement of Indigenous community step further by engaging in a project led by the Indigenous community.</p> <p>I have a few specific comments for consideration in revising this manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Your inclusion criteria states that included literature will “includes all age groups”. Do you mean that all age groups, from birth to old people will need to be presented in the study for it to be included in the scoping review? Or do you mean that literature from any age group will be included in the final scoping review? As this is currently written, it reads that the study must include all age groups, but studies including only a portion of people based on age is not listed as an exclusion criteria, suggesting you intend for this to be any age group included.</li><li>2. Do you have initial key words or MESH headings you will search in databases that could be included in the protocol?</li><li>3. You have identified you will include studies that use both self-reported Métis identity, and verified Métis identity. Will you consider this as a variable to be included in the data extraction? You highlight this as a component of consideration in the data conceptualization and condensation steps.</li><li>4. Some abbreviations are inconsistently used. MNO is used in the later sections of the manuscript, but Métis Nation Ontario is spelled out in the introduction and the abbreviation is not introduced before it is used. ICES is used in the later sections of the manuscript, but is</li></ol>
-------------------------	--

	not expanded to explain what this abbreviation represents.
<b>REVIEWER</b>	Mashford-Pringle, Angela University of Toronto, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, Waakebiness Institute for Indigenous Health
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25-Oct-2023
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Do not use "Aboriginal" as this is an outdated term. Are there other sources about who are Metis other than MNO? There are a number of Metis scholars writing about Metis health in Canada and the statement that there is little written is factually incorrect.

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

Comment #1:

Your inclusion criteria states that included literature will “includes all age groups”. Do you mean that all age groups, from birth to old people will need to be presented in the study for it to be included in the scoping review? Or do you mean that literature from any age group will be included in the final scoping review? As this is currently written, it reads that the study must include all age groups, but studies including only a portion of people based on age is not listed as an exclusion criteria, suggesting you intend for this to be any age group included.

Response #1:

Thank you for pointing out this lack of clarity. We did mean that literature from any age group will be included in the final scoping review and have revised our protocol to reflect our intention.

Comment #2:

Do you have initial key words or MESH headings you will search in databases that could be included in the protocol?

Response #2:

Yes, our key words have been added under the search strategy.

Comment #3:

You have identified you will include studies that use both self-reported Métis identity, and verified Métis identity. Will you consider this as a variable to be included in the data extraction? You highlight this as a component of consideration in the data conceptualization and condensation steps.

Response #3:

Yes, this is included as a variable in the data extraction. We have added this to the methods.

Comment #4:

Some abbreviations are inconsistently used. MNO is used in the later sections of the manuscript, but Métis Nation Ontario is spelled out in the introduction and the abbreviation is not introduced before it is used. ICES is used in the later sections of the manuscript, but is not expanded to explain what this abbreviation represents.

Response #4:

Thank you, we have revised to introduce the acronym when The Métis Nation of Ontario is first introduced. ICES (the acronym) is technically the name of the organization; however, we have included in brackets that it was formerly the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences. That was the name before the organization underwent a rebranding to reflect the population-based and partner-based (including Indigenous partners like the Métis Nation of Ontario) research undertaken at the organization.

Reviewer 2

Comment #1:

Please review the terminology used. Gregory Younging's Elements of Indigenous Style would be the first example. Do not use "Aboriginal" as this is an outdated term. In Canada, we no longer use "Aboriginal Peoples".

Response #1:

Yes, thank you for this feedback. We agree and have revised accordingly.

Comment #2:

Are there other sources about who are Métis other than MNO?

Response #2:

Yes, we have replaced the MNO reference with a Métis National Council reference (Métis registration guide. Ottawa: Métis National Council; 2011) for the same definition.

Comment #3:

There are a number of Metis scholars writing about Metis health in Canada and the statement that there is little written is factually incorrect.

There are many articles about Métis health. Specifically, Dr. Janet Smylie, Dr. Marcia Anderson, Dr. Chris Andersen, Dr. Renee Monchalin. This is not accurate.

Response #3:

We agree with the reviewer that there are many articles about Métis health. Our statement in the introduction directly references the existing systematic review (Kumar, 2009) and we have added an existing narrative (McDougall, 2017), both of which speak to the lack of Métis-specific health research. Part of the drive to do this review was to be able to highlight the growth of Métis-specific health research (as well as contextualize the research we are doing in this area). We anticipate through the scoping review that we will be able to report an increase since 2009 in the number of articles on Métis health, many of which will have been authored by the Métis scholars listed by the reviewer.

Comment #4

You suggested that you were looking for articles by Métis scholars, but it is not listed in your protocol design.

Response #4

Thank you for this comment so we can add clarity to the manuscript. We had included this under data collection: “Métis-involvement (e.g., the observance of one or more Métis authors in the literature)” and upon review we have revised from “Métis-involvement” to specifically say “Métis authorship”.

**Comment #5**

Why 1980? There's no significance provided to this.

**Response #5**

Choosing 1980 as our start date aligns with the objectives of our study and maintains the integrity of our research design since preliminary search strategies before 1980 indicated few or virtually no Metis health outcome-related studies. Concomitantly, Kumar’s systematic review also maintained this start date for similar reasons (availability of comprehensive data and relevance to research objectives). Finally, this deliberate decision was supported by the MNO at the very onset of our search strategy meetings. Using 1980 enabled a look over 4 decades of research so trends (should there be any) would be evident.

**VERSION 2 – REVIEW**

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Foulds, Heather Usask
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	19-Jan-2024
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The manuscript has been appropriately revised.