

## 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>	Self-management interventions Among Community-Dwelling Older Adults with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: A Scoping Review Protocol
<b>AUTHORS</b>	MEHROTRA, SHASHANK; Bhattacharjya, Sutanuka; Shetty, Ranjitha

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Yew, Sheng Qian Universiti Putra Malaysia, Department of Public Health Medicine
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	21-Feb-2024

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•What do the authors mean by “occupational-centered” in the study title? Do the authors mean “occupational therapist-centered”?</li><li>•Is the scoping review protocol registered with any repository? (e.g., open science)</li></ul> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The references to support the prevalence of Type 2 DM are outdated. Kindly provide recent references.</li><li>•The sentence “In 2019, India had the second-highest prevalence of diabetes, with 8.9%” is incomplete. Kindly revise.</li><li>•Kindly define what is “principles”, “practices”, and “criteria” related to self-management in LMICs? Are they describing the “type of intervention” performed by occupational therapist?</li></ul> <p>Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•The search terms for “occupation” and “community dwelling” are missing.</li><li>•Why is it significant to add in “study protocols” during the literature search?</li><li>•What is the cut-off date for the synthesis? Why is such a cut-of date is selected?</li><li>•The inclusion criteria are clearly delineated. However, the exclusion criteria seem to be missing.</li><li>•The authors mention that “The focus will be on the papers related to various professionals such as community physicians/ nurses, and rehabilitation professionals, including occupational therapists, physical therapists, community-based workers, social workers, and speech and language therapists who usually work in rehabilitation settings and may have a direct or indirect role in providing care to older adults diagnosed with type 2 DM in the community”. Since the current scoping review focuses on self-management interventions provided by occupational therapist, why should the other healthcare workers be included?</li></ul>
-------------------------	--

	<p>•What do the authors mean by this sentence “The outcomes ... need not follow any pattern, i.e., primary, or secondary, but different in their scope”? Kindly clarify.</p> <p>Supplementary file:          •Kindly include the supplementary file that consists of the search strategies for the review.</p>
--	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Somprasert, Chomchuen Mahidol University, MU Alumni
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Apr-2024

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>1. I suggested that the scoping review could be cover the outcome of self management which directed to quality of life so the effectiveness of the self managemnet will be fit for elder with the DM type 2.</p> <p>2. On page 2          line 33-34 Scoping review is a design of ssysyemic review that the protocal 've used the PRISMA-ScR by JBI guideline. The Mixed method should be used in primary research. The protoccal 've right explained on type of studies.</p> <p>3. The protocol 've made followed by PRISMA -ScR checklist which strengthening the scoping review.</p>
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

#### Reviewers Comments:

##### Title:

1. What do the authors mean by “occupational-centered” in the study title? Do the authors mean “occupational therapist-centered”?

Reply: We have provided the description in the methodology section of the manuscript and removed the word ‘occupation-centered’ from the title as we will include all the self-management intervention programs for community-dwelling older adults with type 2 DM.

2. Is the scoping review protocol registered with any repository? (e.g., open science)

Reply: No, we have not registered the protocol with any repository – as is common with scoping review protocols.

##### Introduction:

1. The references to support the prevalence of Type 2 DM are outdated. Kindly provide recent references.

Reply: Yes, we have replaced these references with the updated ones.

2. The sentence “In 2019, India had the second-highest prevalence of diabetes, with 8.9%” is incomplete. Kindly revise.

Reply: We have edited the draft and rephrased the sentence in the introduction section.

3. Kindly define what is “principles,” “practices,” and “criteria” related to self-management in LMICs. Are they describing the “type of intervention” performed by occupational therapists?

Reply: We have provided a description of the principles, criteria, and practices related to self-management intervention in the methodology section of the manuscript. Please refer to the text from the manuscript- For this study, principles and criteria would include principles or assumptions of various theories that were referred for developing or implementing various self-management and practices would include practical aspects related to the design, development, and implementation, and use of self-management programs among older adults diagnosed with type 2 DM.

## Methodology

1. The search terms for “occupation” and “community-dwelling” are missing.

Reply: We have not added these search terms since (1) these are not MESH terms, so often, authors don't use these terms with accuracy or with consistency; (2) we wanted to keep the search broad to include various other outcomes and settings where the intervention is provided.

2. Why is it significant to add in “study protocols” during the literature search?

Reply: We wanted to include study protocols as we might get some research articles that may be planned to get better outcomes or address the research gaps identified in the previous research, who describe the principles, practices, and criteria used their self-management intervention protocol.

3. What is the cut-off date for the synthesis? Why is such a cut-off date selected?

Reply: We will be synthesizing data published till April 2024. This timeline is selected as the present study is part of another project where other phases of the same have to be carried out by the investigators.

4. The inclusion criteria are clearly delineated. However, the exclusion criteria seem to be missing.

Reply: We have rephrased the details in the methodology section and added exclusion criteria.

5. The authors mention that “The focus will be on the papers related to various professionals such as community physicians/ nurses, and rehabilitation professionals, including occupational therapists, physical therapists, community-based workers, social workers, and speech and language therapists who usually work in rehabilitation settings and may have a direct or indirect role in providing care to older adults diagnosed with type 2 DM in the community”. Since the current scoping review focuses on self-management interventions provided by occupational therapists, why should the other healthcare workers be included?

Reply: The focus of this scoping review is to explore the various self-management intervention programs, including the principles, criteria, and practices followed by various healthcare workers involved in managing type 2 DM. Hence, we are including the research conducted by other professionals. Considering the multidisciplinary nature of these interventions, often the interventions might be carried out by professionals other than occupational therapists – especially in regions where the number of practicing occupational therapists is low. Through this study, we want to capture all principles, criteria, and practices used in self-management interventions for type 2 DM.

6. What do the authors mean by this sentence, “The outcomes ... need not follow any pattern, i.e., primary, or secondary, but different in their scope”? Kindly clarify.

Reply: We have rephrased this sentence for a better clarity.

### Supplementary materials

1. Kindly include the supplementary file that consists of the search strategies for the review.

Reply: We added the preliminary search string used for PubMed as a supplementary file.

## VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Yew, Sheng Qian Universiti Putra Malaysia, Department of Public Health Medicine
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Jul-2024

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Thank you for addressing all my comments appropriately. The revision and responses from the authors are satisfactory.
-------------------------	--