

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)	Barriers and Facilitators to Employment for Young Adults with Mental Illness: A Scoping Review
AUTHORS	Gmitroski, Taryn; Bradley, Christl; Heinemann, Lyn; Liu, Grace; Blanchard, Paige; Beck, Charlotte; Mathias, Steve; Leon, Adelen; Barbic, Skye

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Polly Yeung Massey University, New Zealand
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I think the topic is timely and relevant. I have some minor issues for the authors to clarify or revise. They are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract - p. 4, line 33, there should be 'and' inserted between "...are important [and] should be recognized...."2. Definition of young adults - p. 7, line 10 to 22. While there is some justification on the definition of young adults, I think it would be good to integrate literature to discuss a bit more on the contested nature of young adults. UN defined youth or young adults as the age cohort of 15-24 while others even extended it to over 30.3. Refer to Table 1, p. 7, line 34 - I am not quite sure whether the authors refer Table 1 as the 19 articles came out from the selection or something else. A clearer statement to refer to Table 1 would be good.4. I am interested to know if there are any specific reasons on why more development of framework for incorporating employment into mental health services for young adults came out in mid-1980s. Perhaps referral to some references would be good (p. 8, line 9 to 18).5. Is p. 1 Figure 1? I could see the title. Also I think it would be good to add "as stated earlier in terms of selection criteria" before the end of the sentence (p. 9, line 28) 'relevant studies'.6. Some unclear sentence structure - p. 12, line 15 to 19 - "The results of this review.....achieve their goal of finding a first job" - check this sentence to make it clear that it is more about getting young people having the variety of experiences, rather than just focusing on getting them a job.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Briano Di Rezze McMaster University, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript entitled Barriers and Facilitators to Employment for Young Adults with Mental Illness: A Scoping Review. Comments for each section are outlined below:

Abstract

Consider revising scoping review question because it should relate to literature (source of content) not from the perspective of individuals.

Appropriate framework identified and databases selected
Inclusion/exclusion criteria were not identified within the abstract, e.g., what types of studies, outcomes, etc. were selected (or at least indicate parameters of types of papers selected).

Conclusion – Revise because the first sentence did not seem to come from the results, but was implied in the purpose of the study. It was also unclear about how “efficiency” relates to improving health and social outcomes. This also does not seem to relate to the results – or at least, it isn’t a clear link.

Strengths/Limitations – 4 points were listed. For the first point, it is unsure what authors mean “comprehensive summary” where scoping review gives overview of the state of the literature. Point #2 doesn’t seem like a strength, but an expectation. Point #4 is not an expectation within scoping reviews, hence it may not need to be stated as a limitation (if following Arksey and O’Malley).

Introduction

Well cited introduction with relevant sources provided.

Some suggestions to better refine the flow of ideas in the introduction below:

Refine some areas of writing, such as, when state “One of the best indicators...for all ages in ability” (page 5, 3rd last sentence). Up to this point in the paper the authors are referring to young adults as young as 12 years old, whereas this statement is likely more relevant to adults.

On page 6 – transition paragraph focused on young adults can focus more on the importance of getting them ready early (emphasize this to better make your point).

Consider adding more detail of “incorporating employment into community mental health” because it seems like a new idea and combines social services with MH services. Alternatively, the authors can show the disconnect between these two services in 1-2 sentences – this needs to be more compelling.

Barriers/facilitators (B/F) to employment – clarify if means B/F of the system (whereby there might be a need to integrate employment with MH services) OR is it about B/F of actual employment and are authors looking to take this information to advise employers, the system or both?

Goal at the end of this section was unclear. Is the goal about identifying the “breadth of knowledge” related to obtaining and maintaining employment in mental health? OR implementation of programs designed to address barriers identified? Also where do facilitators fall in here? Something that is collected in the data.

Methods

The aim in this section should move up into the introduction, which needs to be reconciled with the goal stated in that section. Be consistent and clear with this message and align it with the research question stated later.

Age cohort well justified, but some references could strengthen this section. Perhaps authors should show that there is

	<p>consistency with the literature (e.g., WHO or UNESCO definition of young adults age range).</p> <p>Unsure how comprehensive search strategy was because it states that “mental health disorder” was used, but unclear if specific MH diagnoses were specified for different databases, which could lead to more hits if papers were indexed differently. Provide further justification for search strategy. Other terms were unclear, such as “emerging mental illness”, which can be difficult to define in a search or inclusion criteria. Furthermore, search went up to July 2016 which is 2 years out of date – only did a Google Scholar search to see if anything new up to the present. This will need to be updated or provide more sound justification.</p> <p>Good justification for start of search, as well as, scanning of reference list and including librarian, but should outline contribution of Librarian.</p> <p>Method for charting data was unclear – how did authors come up with key themes and sort them, for example, barriers could be facilitators and vice versa, depending on the context – I think of supportive parents who can help or create a dependence, which can be a barrier or facilitate independence).</p> <p>Results</p> <p>On page 9, second paragraph, “The main qualifications...” should be in the Methods section.</p> <p>In the summary it is unclear how the location of studies and year relate to the research question?</p> <p>Unclear how four themes were derived and wording established. Lack of rigour within the methods and transparency in results, more detail is needed. Headings were also unclear, e.g., employment intervention – is this parsing out employment from mental health support interviews to help with employment success?</p> <p>For theme #2 (age-related) – results seem to be more about amount of exposure vs age of the individual. Explain how evidence supports results (either way).</p> <p>Citations were hard to follow in the results and suggest that citation numbers be included in the table, to make it easier for reader to easily find the studies being referenced.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Polly Yeung

Institution and Country: Massey University, New Zealand

Please state any competing interests or state ‘None declared’: None

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I think the topic is timely and relevant. I have some minor issues for the authors to clarify or revise.

- **Thank you for your thoughtful comments.**

1. Abstract - p. 4, line 33, there should be 'and' inserted between "...are important [and] should be recognized...."

- **Change made**

2. Definition of young adults - p. 7, line 10 to 22. While there is some justification on the definition of young adults, I think it would be good to integrate literature to discuss a bit more on the contested nature of young adults. UN defined youth or young adults as the age cohort of 15-24 while others even extended it to over 30.

- **We have highlighted: "We recognize, in many bodies of literature, youth are defined as 15-24 years¹². Most bodies often reference the 1981 United Nations report⁴⁴, where the Secretary-General first referred to this definition in report to the General Assembly on International Youth Year (A/36/215, para. 8 of the annex)⁴⁵ and endorsed it in ensuing reports (A/40/256, para. 19 of the annex)⁴⁶. However, in the report⁴⁴, the Secretary-General also highlighted that, "the meaning of the term 'youth' varies in different societies around the world." For example, in Canada, most youth employment programs are targeted for youth <30 years old.**

As such, the definitions of age (<30) and each other aspect of the population (mental health status, gender, ethnicity), have been left broad in order to maintain a wide approach that generates a breadth of coverage of the topic."

3. Refer to Table 1, p. 7, line 34 - I am not quite sure whether the authors refer Table 1 as the 19 articles came out from the selection or something else. A clearer statement to refer to Table 1 would be good.

- **A clearer statement is not made two times in the results section. Location of "insert Table 1" was also moved.**

4. I am interested to know if there are any specific reasons on why more development of framework for incorporating employment into mental health services for young adults came out in mid-1980s. Perhaps referral to some references would be good (p. 8, line 9 to 18).

- **Key references have been added to justify this selection.**

5. Is p. 1 Figure 1? I could see the title. Also I think it would be good to add "as stated earlier in terms of selection criteria" before the end of the sentence (p. 9, line 28) 'relevant studies'.

- **Addition added. Thank you for this suggestion. Also p.1 error changed**

6. Some unclear sentence structure - p. 12, line 15 to 19 - "The results of this review.....achieve their goal of finding a first job" - check this sentence to make it clear that it is more about getting young people having the variety of experiences, rather than just focusing on getting them a job.

- **Change made. Thank you for catching this.**

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Briano Di Rezze

Institution and Country: McMaster University, Canada

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript entitled Barriers and Facilitators to Employment for Young Adults with Mental Illness: A Scoping Review.

- **Thank you for your very detailed review and thoughtful comments.**

Comments for each section are outlined below:

Abstract

Consider revising scoping review question because it should relate to literature (source of content) not from the perspective of individuals.

- **We understand your comment. We have changed the question to read: ““What are the barriers and facilitators to employment for young adults with mental illness?”**

Appropriate framework identified and databases selected

- Thank you

Inclusion/exclusion criteria were not identified within the abstract, e.g., what types of studies, outcomes, etc. were selected (or at least indicate parameters of types of papers selected). □ **We have now added: “We included any study that considered young adults, aged 15– 29 years of age with a mental health diagnosis, who were seeking employment or part of an employment intervention.”**

Conclusion – Revise because the first sentence did not seem to come from the results, but was implied in the purpose of the study. It was also unclear about how “efficiency” relates to improving health and social outcomes. This also does not seem to relate to the results – or at least, it isn’t a clear link.

- **Upon review we also agree. We have changed the conclusion now to align more closely with the results.**

Strengths/Limitations – 4 points were listed. For the first point, it is unsure what authors mean “comprehensive summary” where scoping review gives overview of the state of the literature. Point #2 doesn’t seem like a strength, but an expectation. Point #4 is not an expectation within scoping reviews, hence it may not need to be stated as a limitation (if following Arksey and O’Malley).

- **Thank you. Changes have been made to this section.**

Introduction

Well cited introduction with relevant sources provided.

- **Thank you**

Some suggestions to better refine the flow of ideas in the introduction below:

Refine some areas of writing, such as, when state “One of the best indicators...for all ages in ability” (page 5, 3rd last sentence). Up to this point in the paper the authors are referring to young adults as young as 12 years old, whereas this statement is likely more relevant to adults.

- **Excellent point. Change made. Also added a section to emphasize and delineate the youth versus adults.**

On page 6 – transition paragraph focused on young adults can focus more on the importance of getting them ready early (emphasize this to better make your point).

- **Agree. Change made**

Consider adding more detail of “incorporating employment into community mental health” because it seems like a new idea and combines social services with MH services. Alternatively, the authors can show the disconnect between these two services in 1-2 sentences – this needs to be more compelling.

- **Two sentences added**

Barriers/facilitators (B/F) to employment – clarify if means B/F of the system (whereby there might be a need to integrate employment with MH services) OR is it about B/F of actual employment and are authors looking to take this information to advise employers, the system or both? ☐ **Excellent point. We have now clarified this**

Goal at the end of this section was unclear. Is the goal about identifying the “breadth of knowledge” related to obtaining and maintaining employment in mental health? OR implementation of programs designed to address barriers identified? Also where do facilitators fall in here? Something that is collected in the data.

- **Goal has been clarified with suggested recommendations.**

Methods

The aim in this section should move up into the introduction, which needs to be reconciled with the goal stated in that section. Be consistent and clear with this message and align it with the research question stated later.

- **We are maintaining consistency with other BMJ articles that use the Arskey and O’Malley framework- where the aim is set in the methods section, stage 1.**

Age cohort well justified, but some references could strengthen this section. Perhaps authors should show that there is consistency with the literature (e.g., WHO or UNESCO definition of young adults age range).

- **Similar comment to reviewer 1. We have now added a stronger section on this. Thank you. A great learning for us too!**

Unsure how comprehensive search strategy was because it states that “mental health disorder” was used, but unclear if specific MH diagnoses were specified for different databases, which could lead to more hits if papers were indexed differently. Provide further justification for search strategy.

- **We have now included the full search strategy and specified the role of the librarian in this search to ensure the robustness of the search.**

Other terms were unclear, such as “emerging mental illness”, which can be difficult to define in a search or inclusion criteria. Furthermore, search went up to July 2016 which is 2 years out of date –

only did a Google Scholar search to see if anything new up to the present. This will need to be updated or provide more sound justification.

- **We have updated the search to October 1st, 2018**

Good justification for start of search, as well as, scanning of reference list and including librarian, but should outline contribution of Librarian.

- **Thank you. We have added this.**

Method for charting data was unclear – how did authors come up with key themes and sort them, for

example, barriers could be facilitators and vice versa, depending on the context – I think of supportive parents who can help or create a dependence, which can be a barrier or facilitate independence).

- **We charted data based on how themes were reported in the paper. We have clarified this in the methods section (second to last paragraph).**

Results

On page 9, second paragraph, “The main qualifications...” should be in the Methods section. □

Agree. Moved to methods

In the summary it is unclear how the location of studies and year relate to the research question?

- **The research aim specifies that we want to know the breath of evidence available. We have added sources to the aim.**

Unclear how four themes were derived and wording established. Lack of rigour within the methods and transparency in results, more detail is needed. Headings were also unclear, e.g., employment intervention – is this parsing out employment from mental health support interviews to help with employment success?

- Thank you for this comment. We have now included more details in this section. Heads were also modified to be clear.

For theme #2 (age-related) – results seem to be more about amount of exposure vs age of the individual. Explain how evidence supports results (either way).

- **The reviewer is correct re: exposure and age. This has been changed.**

Citations were hard to follow in the results and suggest that citation numbers be included in the table, to make it easier for reader to easily find the studies being referenced.

- **We have now included the citation numbers in the tables.**

FORMATTING AMENDMENTS (if any)

Required amendments will be listed here; please include these changes in your revised version: - Please provide another copy of your figures with better qualities and please ensure that Figures are of better quality or not pix-elated when zoom in. NOTE: They can be in TIFF or JPG format and make

sure that they have a resolution of at least 300 dpi and at least 90mm x 90m of width. Figures in PDF, DOCUMENT, EXCEL and POWER POINT format are not acceptable.

- **Figures are now in JPG**

Please provide complete affiliations (institutions and department) for all the authors both in the manuscript and in the submission system (Scholar One).

- **Complete**

Please embed your DATA SHARING STATEMENT in your main document file as shown in scholar one.

- **Complete**

- We have implemented an additional requirement to all articles to include 'Patient and Public Involvement' statement within the main text of your main document. Please refer below for more information regarding this new instruction:

Authors must include a statement in the methods section of the manuscript under the sub-heading 'Patient and Public Involvement'.

This should provide a brief response to the following questions:

How was the development of the research question and outcome measures informed by patients' priorities, experience, and preferences?

How did you involve patients in the design of this study?

Were patients involved in the recruitment to and conduct of the study?

How will the results be disseminated to study participants?

For randomised controlled trials, was the burden of the intervention assessed by patients themselves?

Patient advisers should also be thanked in the contributorship statement/acknowledgements. If patients and or public were not involved please state this.

- This section has been now added to the methods section.**

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Polly Yeung Massey University, New Zealand
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Oct-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The revised manuscript has definitely further strengthened the readability and credibility of the study. The only very minor error I spotted was on p. 8, line 35 to add "be" after the word "also".
-------------------------	--

