PEER REVIEW HISTORY

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The healing journey: a qualitative analysis of the healing experiences of Americans suffering from trauma & illness
AUTHORS	Scott, John; Warber, Sara; Dieppe, Paul; Jones, David; Stange, Kurt

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Maggie Long Ulster University Northern Ireland United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Apr-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an interesting paper and the data is very rich and meaningful. I have some comments: This is a qualitative study, therefore 'participants' have actively participated in the research - not 'subjects', which connotes positivist enquiry. Change all reference of subjects to participants. Methods section p. 5 line 46 – We did –change to: We conducted … p. 5 long interviews – would be in-depth interviews p. 6 assessment of publications, reputation, and awards. – how were these assessed? p. 8 Results –change to Findings Paragraph on Participants should be in Methodology section above - Sampling, Participants Top and tail data extracts i.e. do not end sections with a quote, provide a summative sentence p. 16, para 2, ll.9-21 – this reads like a lit review, identify where the findings of this study diverge from/build upon existing lit. Methodological decisions based on existing lit belong in lit review. I think the point that health professionals are only one aspect of a person's healing journey, is significant and more could be made of this and more links with existing research, particularly building upon existing medical research, as this is something that is recognised in medical sociology Related to above, the concluding paragraph in relation to implications for healthcare professionals' practice, could be strengthened to explain how health professionals could incorporate their role into the wider context of patients' life

REVIEWER	Larry R. Churchill, Stahlman Professor of Medical Ethics Vanderbilt University Medical Center Nashville, TN 37203 U.S.A.
REVIEW RETURNED	15-May-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a superb study filling an important gap in our knowledge about how people move from injury and suffering toward healing. The study builds upon and adds to the existing research, focusing upon the suffering person's journey from illness and suffering to healing, rather than focusing upon the health professionals' roles or privileging the professional-patient relationship as somehow being especially important. This is the best, brief phenomenological portrait of healing we have available. The authors have done an excellent job of stating their analysis in humanistic (rather than technical) terms. The model that illustrates the dynamics among the elements of the "healing journey" is well-conceived and transparent. I think anyone who works with wounded or suffering persons will find this study has "the ring of truth" about it. I hope someone will convince the authors to write a longer essay, with more descriptions and quotations from their study and greater detail in their analysis.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

This is an interesting paper and the data is very rich and meaningful. I have some comments:

Thank you

This is a qualitative study, therefore 'participants' have actively participated in the research - not 'subjects', which connotes positivist enquiry. Change all reference of subjects to participants.

Thank you, we have changed the wording as suggested

Methods section
p. 5 line 46 – We did –change to: We conducted … p. 5 long interviews – would be in-depth interviews p. 6 assessment of publications, reputation, and awards. – how were these assessed?

We have made the suggested changes

p. 8 Results –change to Findings
Paragraph on Participants should be in Methodology section above - Sampling, Participants

We have made this change as well

Top and tail data extracts i.e. do not end sections with a quote, provide a summative sentence

Done, thank you

p. 16, para 2, ll.9-21 – this reads like a lit review, identify where the findings of this study diverge from/build upon existing lit. Methodological decisions based on existing lit belong in lit review.

We have revised the discussion to show how our work expands upon and is different from the existing literature.

I think the point that health professionals are only one aspect of a person's healing journey, is significant and more could be made of this and more links with existing research, particularly building upon existing medical research, as this is something that is recognised in medical sociology

Thank you, yes, this fits in with much sociological work such as that of Kleinman, and we have added a sentence in the discussion to emphasise this point.

Related to above, the concluding paragraph in relation to implications for healthcare professionals' practice, could be strengthened to explain how health professionals could incorporate their role into the wider context of patients' life

Thank you for that suggestion, we have altered the conclusion accordingly.

Reviewer: 2

This is a superb study filling an important gap in our knowledge about how people move from injury and suffering toward healing. The study builds upon and adds to the existing research, focusing upon the suffering person's journey from illness and suffering to healing, rather than focusing upon the health professionals' roles or privileging the professional-patient relationship as somehow being especially important. This is the best, brief phenomenological portrait of healing we have available. The authors have done an excellent job of stating their analysis in humanistic (rather than technical) terms. The model that illustrates the dynamics among the elements of the "healing journey" is well-conceived and transparent.

I think anyone who works with wounded or suffering persons will find this study has "the ring of truth" about it. I hope someone will convince the authors to write a longer essay, with more descriptions and quotations from their study and greater detail in their analysis.

We are grateful for these generous comments

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Maggie Long Ulster University, Northern Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Jun-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	This manuscript is much improved and in my opinion makes a valuable contribution to the field. I hope the authors are pleased with the revised version, as they have addressed the comments thoroughly.