

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Experiences of family caregivers and nursing home staff interactions during the adaptation process of elderly individuals moving to nursing home: a qualitative study
AUTHORS	Zhao, DI; Shao, Hongyan; Wang, Peng; xie, luping; Chen, Zhenghua

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	Rayner, JA
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	La Trobe University, Australian Centre for Evidence Based Age Care
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	30-Jan-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an interesting and important paper; however, it requires revision before acceptance for publication.</p> <p>Abstract Page 2, Line 12: I feel the word 'migrating' is inappropriate – perhaps change this to moving. Also, the sentence needs the addition of 'an' before institution to read: '...the percentage of elderly individuals moving into an institution....' Consider using one or the other consistently: elderly people or older adults.</p> <p>Introduction Page 4, Line 47: Change nursing home caregiver to nursing home staff.</p> <p>Methods Study participants and settings Page 6, Line 46: delete – the family carer to read –'Acts as the primary carer of the older.....' Page 6, Line 49: delete - 'They' to read 'can communicate....' Page 6, Line 52: delete 'They' before each point (I, ii, iii).</p> <p>Data Collection Page 7, Line 17: a pre-experiment? Do you mean a pilot study? Page 7, Line 27: Does 'personal in-depth interviews mean fac-to-face interviews?</p> <p>Data Analysis Page 7, Line 54: delete '...were conducted by the first author and'... as this is stated above. Page 8, Line 5: The word surveyors is not commonly used in qualitative research. I would suggest replacing this with the word interviewers. Page 8, Line 24: I would suggest replacing '..reviewed by two professors in nursing' with '..two experienced qualitative researchers.'</p> <p>Results</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Page 9, Table 2: There is a discrepancy in the gender of the caregivers interviewed. Gender shows Female=2, however further down relationship shows Daughter = 9. As daughters are always female could it be possible that the Genders were transposed?</p> <p>Page 10, Line 6: please correct the tense in this sentence.</p> <p>Page 10, Line 7: remove the word 'both' from the sentence commencing ..Family caregivers...</p> <p>Page 10, Line 7: quote needs aligning with other quotes.</p> <p>Page 11, Line 31: quotes need to be aligned and spaced.</p> <p>Page 11, Line 47: Correct – staff rather than staffs – please check the entire manuscript for this error. This sentence also needs revising as it is repetitive.</p> <p>Page 12, Line 11: Please explain 'the negative incidents in society regarding the abuse of the elderly by elderly institutions'? This sentence is unclear and too long.</p> <p>Page 13, Line 42: Remove the word this at the end of the line.</p> <p>Page 14, Line 23: Please correct the grammar in this sentence – was should be replaced with were.</p> <p>Page 14, Line 26: A capital letter is needed for 'nursing' at the start of this sentence.</p> <p>Page 14, Line49: References are generally nit used in the results or findings sections of a manuscript.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>General reading for grammar and tense is required.</p> <p>General Issues</p> <p>All quotes need conformity in presentation, e.g., full-stop after the bracket representing the ID of the participant.</p> <p>The tense changes throughout the document and the manuscript needs to be revised for an English-speaking audience.</p> <p>Reference list</p> <p>Page 22 needs formatting.</p> <p>All references need to align with the Vancouver format.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER NAME	Oyinlola, Oluwagbemiga
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	McGill University School of Social Work
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None.
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	01-Mar-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I am delighted to be reviewing this manuscript, The abstract is well-written but always look to refine sentences to make them as clear and concise as possible, ensuring the abstract remains within the journal's word limit. But my question now, what is the strength and weakness of this manuscript?</p> <p>While this study offers a detailed exploration of the dynamics between family members and nursing home staff, highlighting the complexity of these relationships. Still the identification of key themes offers valuable insights into the adaptation process for older adults in nursing homes, contributing to the literature on geriatric care. The qualitative approach is well-suited to capture the nuanced experiences of participants, demonstrating methodological rigor. However, before are my concerns, and issues on this paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think Some themes and sub-themes may benefit from further clarification and examples to enhance the reader's understanding of the findings. Providing more detailed descriptions or additional quotes from participants could enrich the analysis. 2. Expand on the practical implications of the findings for nursing home management and policy. Concrete recommendations or
-------------------------	--

	<p>guidelines could make the study more valuable for practitioners and policymakers.</p> <p>3. The conclusion section should succinctly summarize the key findings, their implications, and the recommended actions for stakeholders. Ensure it encapsulates the study's value and contributions to the field.</p> <p>4. I wonder if you have considered integrating findings with broader theoretical frameworks to enhance the study's depth and relevance to existing research.</p> <p>Thank you for a great job.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1. Please work to improve the quality of the writing throughout your manuscript.

We recommend asking a colleague who is proficient in written English to assist you.

Grammatical issues raised by reviewer 1.

In addition, the team invited native English speakers for touch-ups to ensure readability.

. Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable

feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made

the following changes to the title. Experiences of family members and nursing home staff interactions during the

adaptation process of older people moving to a residential care facility: a qualitative

study. 3. After your abstract, please include a section consisting of the heading:

'Strengths and limitations of this study'. Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable

feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made

the following changes to the content. Strengths and limitations of this study

This is the first qualitative descriptive study that has explored the interactions

between family caregivers and nursing home staff during the adjustment period

of newly admitted elderly people in nursing homes in China.

The qualitative descriptive design ensured an extensive and deep exploration of

the interaction experience between family caregivers and nursing home staff

during the adjustment period of newly admitted elderly people in nursing home. This study represents the inaugural qualitative investigation on this topic, yielding

pertinent research evidence in the context of the subject matter. As the participants in this study were mainly from Henan, China, caution should

be exercised when using the findings of this study in different regions. Using only interview methodology, this study, for the time being, provides a

preliminary understanding of the research topic. 4. Please move information about ethics approval to the methods section. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. We have made changes to the manuscript. 5. Can you please work on improving the limitations section in the discussion?

Given this is a qualitative study, How did you determine the sample size for this study?

Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made the following changes to the content, which have been added to the description in the "STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS" section. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first in China to explore the interactions between family caregivers and nursing home staff during the adjustment period of newly admitted elderly people in nursing homes through qualitative interviews. However, there are still some limitations to this study. First of all, the results of this study were derived from qualitative interviews rather than quantitative research; thus, its universality may be affected. However, it is essential to acknowledge that these results are derived from the inner real experience of family caregivers and nursing home staff and are unaffected by the scale. Ultimately, the participants were from Henan, China. Therefore, our results may not apply to other countries. The recruitment process reached its conclusion when no new themes arose, indicating that data saturation had been achieved. 6. The Patient and Public Involvement statement should be included as a

sub-heading in the methods section of all manuscripts. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. We

have made changes to the manuscript. We have made the following changes to the content, which have been added to the description in the "METHODS" section. Patient and Public Involvement statement

During the recruitment phase of the study, the researchers invited some older people to help invite potential participants. The manuscript was sent to all participants who provided their email addresses when the interviews were conducted. 7. I think Some themes and sub-themes may benefit from further clarification

and examples to enhance the reader's understanding of the findings. Providing more detailed descriptions or additional quotes from participants could enrich the analysis. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. We

have made changes to the manuscript. We have made the following changes to the

content, which have been added to the description in the "RESULTS" section. 8. Expand on the practical implications of the findings for nursing home

management and policy. Concrete recommendations or guidelines could make the

study more valuable for practitioners and policymakers. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. Our team is currently working on relevant guidelines and policies.

9. The conclusion section should succinctly summarize the key findings, their

implications, and the recommended actions for stakeholders. Ensure it encapsulates

the study's value and contributions to the field. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. We have made changes to the manuscript. We have made the following changes to the

content, which have been added to the description in the "CONCLUSION" section. These findings may increase the awareness of healthcare providers regarding

the development of interactions between family caregivers and nursing home staff for

relocated older individuals. The findings derived from this study are valuable for

developing efficient interactive interventions. For instance, future research may focus

on developing and testing interventions that incorporate a protocol or health education

component. These interventions would include an explanation of the agency's care

activities and the role of family caregivers, as well as particular information that the

agency aims to gather from family caregivers. Interventions that facilitate engagement

between family caregivers and nursing home staff might enhance the evaluation of

care by providing prompt feedback. Additionally, it can aid in acquainting family

caregivers with various care practices, hence enhancing their efficacy. 10. I wonder if you have considered integrating findings with broader theoretical

frameworks to enhance the study's depth and relevance to existing research. Response: We are very grateful to the editors and reviewers for their comments. Currently, our team is working on the construction of interactive interventions and

includes research on relevant theoretical frameworks. We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes marked in

red in revised paper. We appreciated for Editors and Reviewer's work earnestly, and hope the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for

your comments and suggestion.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	Rayner, JA
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	La Trobe University, Australian Centre for Evidence Based Age Care

REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None.
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	17-Apr-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This manuscript is improved but still requires minor edits. It does present interesting findings on staff family interactions in China nursing homes.</p> <p>Abstract Page 2, line 12: Removed the word 'via and second 'interview' from this sentence to read... Interviews were conducted face-to-face. Page 2, Line 14: Revise sentence to read...Interviews were undertaken with 15 nursing home staff and 12 family members of recently admitted elderly individuals in three nursing facilities in a major Chinese urban center. Page 2, Line 21: Revised the sentence to read... The five themes identified are....</p> <p>Strengths and limitations Page 2, line 50, point 3. This point is the same as point one. Remove.</p> <p>Introduction Page 3, line 50: remove the second 'alleviate' so the sentence reads... Nursing homes can alleviate the responsibility of supporting children and the financial strain.... Page 4, lines 9 and 39: Use the same word throughout the manuscript - either nursing homes or residential care facilities if meaning the same thing. Page 4, lines 12 and 17: Using the word 'furthermore' should be reconsidered in all instances. It is very repetitive, especially if opening one sentence after another. Page 4, lines 22 and 23: combine the two sentences into one sentence.</p> <p>Methods Design Page 6, line 16: revise the sentence to read...utilizing semi-structured face-to-face interviews in nursing homes.... Page 6, Line 16: Using 'nursing homes', 'residential care facilities', and 'nursing care facilities' interchangeably is confusing – please choose one term and revise throughout the manuscript. Page 6, line 29: the sentence ' we employed a descriptive... should be moved further up in the paragraph, perhaps before the sentence ...The phenomenology....(line 18).</p> <p>Study participants and setting Page 7, line 5: please add (i) before the first criteria for inclusion. Revise the sentence to read...The inclusion criteria for the nursing home staff in the study were that they: (i) had been working autonomously for a minimum of six months; (ii)have received training at the nursing homes; (iii) possess the ability....</p> <p>Data Collection Page 8, line 49: Please provide a reference for the term data saturation.</p> <p>Data Analysis Page 8, line 58: The sentence starting 'Adhering to the... 'is not a sentence. Either remove the full stop after the reference or rewrite.</p> <p>Results Page 13, line 23: Use one word – nursing home staff or institutional staff – for consistency throughout the manuscript. Page 13, line 23: The sentence starting ...'The frequent turnover'... needs revision.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Page 13, line 48: Are elderly care facilities the same as nursing homes, residential aged care facilities, and nursing home facilities? For consistency, please use one term to describe these e.g., nursing homes.</p> <p>Page 14, line 56: Please change the word 'was' to were to blame'</p> <p>Page 15, line 19: Please explain what the term 'lack of correct cognition between...' means.</p> <p>Page 17, line 39: the word researcher should be replaced with the 'findings suggest'...</p> <p>Page 18, line 43: revise the sentence as the word 'institutes' seems inappropriate.</p> <p>Page 18, line 49: please remove the word 'discovery' and replace it with findings; should the word researcher be 'research'?</p> <p>Page 19, line 5: Evidence needs to be provided for the statement ' Nevertheless, the frequency of disputes....'</p> <p>Page 19, line 10: Does the term 'nursing institutions' refer to nursing homes?</p> <p>There are still grammatical issues with this paper and the consistent use of interchangeable terms, e.g., elderly individuals or senior individuals; workers, nursing home personnel or staff; nursing homes, nursing care institutions, or residential care facilities; researchers or authors etc. which retract from the paper. Please revise and use consistent terminology.</p>
--	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1. Abstract >> Participants: Please remove "in a major Chinese urban center" at the end of the sentence (you currently say this twice)

Response: We are very grateful for the reviewers' comments. We provide clear definitions of relevant terms and perform spell-checking throughout the text. In addition, the team invited native English speakers for touch-ups to ensure readability.

2. Introduction: Page 2: "intactive experience" should be "interactive experience"; Page 2: "newly admitted elderly individuals in nursing home" should be "newly admitted elderly individuals in the nursing home"; Introduction, page 3: "eldery individuals" => elderly individuals; Introduction, page 4: "eldery individuals" => elderly individuals; page 4: "The research has highlighted the need of directing attention.." should be "Research has highlighted the need to direct attention.." Introduction, Page 5: "help elderly individuals adapt to nursing home" should be "help elderly individuals adapt to nursing homes". Page 10: ". But Patients and the public were not involved in the design and conception of this study." Revise this to: "Patients and the public were not involved in the design and conception of this study."

Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made the following changes to the introduction section.

3. Discussion: "The author examined the factors contributing to this phenomenon and identified two main reasons." Please revise "The author". Perhaps: "We examined the factors contributing to this phenomenon and identified two main reasons."? Discussion: "The stduy have determined.." => "This

study has determined..”? Discussion: “elderly individuals” => elderly individuals (this typographical error is present throughout the paper). Discussion: “The researcher suggests providing knowledge and skills training to nursing home staff as a means to enhance their overall quality and competence.” Suggest: “Providing knowledge and skills training to nursing home staff could enhance their overall quality and competence.”

Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made the following changes to the Discussion part.

4. In the Discussion section please review the following: “There is a dearth of interaction between nursing home staff and family caregivers in Chinese nursing homes. The nursing home fail to promptly address the needs of elderly individuals upon their transition to long-term residential facilities. This study identified a lack of interaction between family caregivers and nursing home staff. This findings aligns with prior research [64,65].” The quality and clarity of the English is poor here; it is also repetitive. Can this be changed to just: “This study identified a lack of interaction between family caregivers and nursing home staff, which aligns with prior research [64,65].”?

Response: We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have made the following changes to the content.