

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)	International Experiments with Different Models of Allocating Funds to Facilitate Integrated Care: A Scoping Review Protocol
AUTHORS	hayatzadeh-Mahani, Akram; Nolte, Ellen; Sutherland, Jason; Forest, Pierre-Gerlier

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Verena Struckmann Berlin University of Technology, Department of Health Care Management, Germany
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Apr-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I note that there are more limitations than referred to, please add more limitations for this method.</p> <p>Additional databases, which should be considered for the scoping review are: Scopus or Cochrane.</p> <p>Additional sources used could be websites of EU and international projects dealing with the topic.</p> <p>Add recent publications to the list of references as, e.g. Struckmann V* et al. (2018). Relevant models and elements of integrated care for multi-morbidity: Results of a scoping review. Health Policy</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Jonathan Stokes, Research Fellow Manchester Centre for Health Economics, University of Manchester, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Apr-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The protocol provides a nice clear introduction with information on the need for the review and general outline of the approach. Generally, the methodology is well-described. The authors outline an ambitious number of objectives and a very ambitious time-scale, so I wish them the best of luck.</p> <p>I just have a few points that I would like to see clarified by the authors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overarching clarification is regarding how exactly the review differs from a systematic review. I know this is difficult, as the two overlap in a number of ways (as described in the Arksey & O'Malley framework quoted) and the scoping review definition is a loose one in itself. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o I'm not sure, then, how appropriate it is to describe the scoping review with words such as "systematically" "comprehensive review" as the authors do. This could be misleading and add to the confusion. o Arksey & O'Malley state, "Generally speaking, these four types [of
-------------------------	---

	<p>scoping review] suggest two different ways of thinking about the role or purpose of a scoping study”. It might be helpful for the authors to more explicitly state which type of scoping review this is, as the study has a large number of objectives and research questions that make this somewhat difficult to pin down.</p> <p>o I’m not sure how appropriate it is to look at intervention effects in scoping review rather than with a systematic review (Research question: “3. What is the evidence of impact of those models of allocating funds to facilitate integration as given by authors?”). This could potentially lead to misleading results, as the authors are not assessing study quality, meta-analysis and publication bias. Indeed, Arksey & O’Malley state in their framework that in a scoping review (versus a systematic review) “there is no attempt made to present a view regarding the ‘weight’ of evidence in relation to particular interventions or policies” (Arksey & O’Malley)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods, Step 5, will extract “type of integrated funding models”. <p>Will this be classified initially to an existing framework/typology, or is this an iterative process that is linked to development of your own framework?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methods, Search strategy. Appendix Table 1 has four AND operators in the Medline example, but only details three in the search terms section at the bottom of the table/in the main text. Appear to be missing “AND Funding/Financing”
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to review your study protocol. The aims are relevant, the protocol is well written and the methods are appropriate.

Thanks for your positive feedback.

I note that there are more limitations than referred to, please add more limitations for this method.

We had already pointed to two limitations of our review methodology including lack of quality appraisal of identified literature (that is common for all scoping reviews) as well as limiting search language to English. We have added another limitation: the broadness of our review scope.

Additional databases, which are should be considered for the scoping review are: Scopus or Cochrane.

Thanks for this helpful comment. We have added both Scopus and Cochrane Library to our databases within the text and Appendix Table 2.

Additional sources used could be websites of EU and international projects dealing with the topic.

Thanks for this comment. We added the website of few other agencies/organizations including he European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), National Institutes for Health (NIH), and Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR). We have revised the Appendix Table 2 too.

Add recent publications to the list of references as, e.g.Struckmann V* et al. (2018). Relevant models and elements of integrated care for multi-morbidity: Results of a scoping review. Health Policy

Thanks for brining this important paper to our attention. We found it helpful and relevant and have added it to our reference list.

Reviewer: 2

The protocol provides a nice clear introduction with information on the need for the review and general outline of the approach. Generally, the methodology is well-described. The authors outline an ambitious number of objectives and a very ambitious time-scale, so I wish them the best of luck.

Thanks for your positive feedback.

The overarching clarification is regarding how exactly the review differs from a systematic review. I know this is difficult, as the two overlap in a number of ways (as described in the Arksey & O'Malley framework quoted) and the scoping review definition is a loose one in itself. I'm not sure, then, how appropriate it is to describe the scoping review with words such as "systematically" "comprehensive review" as the authors do. This could be misleading and add to the confusion.

We agree with the referee that the two types of review overlap in many ways. However, there are two key differences between scoping reviews and systematic reviews including: 1) a systematic review typically focuses on a well-defined question and includes specific study designs identified apriori while a scoping review addresses a broader topic and includes many different study designs. 2) A systematic review tends to answer a very specific and narrow research question and assesses the quality of studies for inclusion while a scoping review tends to answer to a broader research question and does not assess the quality of studies for inclusion¹. A scoping review can inform a systematic review^{2,3} and build on systematic review methods³. Scoping reviews use systematic methods¹, as described in detail in our methodology, although they do not focus on a narrow and specific research question as systematic reviews do. We have revised the text for better clarity.

Arksey & O'Malley state, "Generally speaking, these four types [of scoping review] suggest two different ways of thinking about the role or purpose of a scoping study". It might be helpful for the authors to more explicitly state which type of scoping review this is, as the study has a large number of objectives and research questions that make this somewhat difficult to pin down.

Thanks for this helpful comment. Our review is similar to type three (to summarise and disseminate research findings) and four (to identify research gaps in the existing literature) of Arksey & O'Malley typology of scoping reviews. These are reflected in objectives 1,2, 6 of our review. We have conceived our review as a method in its own right that will lead to the publication and dissemination of research findings on models of allocating funds to support integrated care. Synthesis of existing evidence and consultation of findings with a wide range of stakeholders will allow us to draw out policy opportunities and lessons that can be applied to the Canadian context with a focus on Alberta and British Columbia provinces. Although we will identify gaps in the existing evidence that may lead to a full systematic review, we are not aiming to conduct a systematic review. We have revised the text for better clarity.

I'm not sure how appropriate it is to look at intervention effects in scoping review rather than with a systematic review (Research question: "3. What is the evidence of impact of those models of allocating funds to facilitate integration as given by authors?"). This could potentially lead to misleading results, as the authors are not assessing study quality, meta-analysis and publication bias. Indeed, Arksey & O'Malley state in their framework that in a scoping review (versus a systematic review) "there is no attempt made to present a view regarding the 'weight' of evidence in relation to particular interventions or policies" (Arksey & O'Malley)

We agree with the referee that systematic review, especially meta-analysis, is the best method to investigate the impact of a single intervention/policy. As mentioned before, we will conduct a scoping review, a type of meta-synthesis, that is not focused on a well-defined and narrow research question such as the impact of a single intervention (e.g. a funding model) on a single health system or patient outcome (e.g. access to care, patient satisfaction, or care coordination). As the scope of our review is broad and is not focused on a single funding model, analysis of the data collected using the data extraction framework will provide information on diverse models of allocating funds to facilitate integrated care. Stage five of our review protocol (i.e. collating, summarising and reporting the results) will allow us to collate and summarise evidence on impact and the degree of success of identified models of allocating funds to facilitate care integration, if reported by authors, where the degree of success is measured against the outcomes that health systems are trying to achieve including, among others, care integration, cost growth reduction, and maximization of patients' clinical and experience outcomes. We have included a list of revised research questions that reflect the views of diverse knowledge users who contributed to a grant application to Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), which is now approved for funding.

Methods, Step 5, will extract "type of integrated funding models". Will this be classified initially to an existing framework/typology, or is this an iterative process that is linked to development of your own framework?

Thanks for this comment. Extracting data on "type of integrated funding models" from included materials is an iterative process that is linked to development of our conceptual framework. During the synthesis phase in stage five of our review protocol, we will systematically combine the extracted data and will develop a taxonomy of models of allocating funds to facilitate integration.

Methods, Search strategy. Appendix Table 1 has four AND operators in the Medline example, but only details three in the search terms section at the bottom of the table/in the main text. Appear to be missing "AND Funding/Financing"

Thank for your meticulous check. We have revised the Appendix Table 1.

1. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International journal of social research methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
2. Armstrong R, Hall BJ, Doyle J, Waters E. 'Scoping the scope' of a cochrane review. *Journal of Public Health*. 2011;33(1):147-150.
3. Langlois EV, Ranson MK, Bärnighausen T, et al. Advancing the field of health systems research synthesis. *Systematic reviews*. 2015;4(1):90.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Jonathan Stokes Research Fellow, Manchester Centre for Health Economics, University of Manchester, United Kingdom
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jun-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have addressed all of the previous editorial and reviewer comments. I recommend publication of the current version.