

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)	A phenomenological approach to childhood cataract treatment in New Zealand using semi-structured interviews: How might we improve provision of care?
AUTHORS	Hamm, Lisa; Boluk, Karla; Black, Joanna; Dai, Shuan; Thompson, Benjamin

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Assist Prof Thuss sanguansak department of ophthalmologist, Faculty of medicine, Khonkaen university, Khonkaen, Thailand
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	It look like the descriptive study in presenting the medical teamwork to improve the healthcare that is better that working independent. Congenital cataract has not been found often but has the impact both patients and their family.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Abdul Mutalib Faculty of Medicine Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Congratulation. A very well designed and written study report. Will be a major contribution to other many on how to improve their eye care system.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Songul Cinaroglu Hacettepe University, Department of Health Care Management, Ankara, Turkey
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Dear Editor, Thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to review the manuscript number: bmjopen-2018-024869 . Following statements includes my review notes according the different sections of the manuscript. Sincerely, MANUSCRIPT TITLE: "A phenomenological approach to childhood cataract treatment using semi-structured interviews: How might we improve provision of care?" REFEREE REPORT
-------------------------	---

Firstly, I want to thank the author(s) pointing out this very specific topic. The manuscript is well written and gave a potential to contribute the literature about cataract care for children. Kindly, following sections include some of my suggestions to improve the contribution of study.

Abstract section is well structured and well organized. It includes all parts of the manuscript.

- There is a need for more literature information for background section.
- I advise author(s) to add more literature information into the text about following topics:
- It will be useful to provide more information about health system and the status of cataract care in New Zealand and also, I advise to discuss study findings while considering cataract care in New Zealand.
- It will be a good idea to give more information about health system, the level of child care in terms of public health perspective in New Zealand.
- Put parenthesis before URL in page 6, line 111.
- Additionally, this link gives an error and it is not opening.
- Avoid very short paragraphs like page 18, line 401, merge these sentences with above or below paragraphs.
- Cataract care for children is a very specific issue, I strongly advice author(s) to emphasize this issue as a strength of this study.
- I advise author(s) to give more specific advices from cataract care management perspective. What are the advices of author(s) for improving the efficiency of cataract care for children.
- It will be a good idea to emphasize the difference between cataract care for children between low income countries and high income ones, like New Zealand.
- The first sentence of the conclusion part not belongs to this section. It is a part of the literature review. I advise to give a very brief overview about the study. What this study adds to the literature and what are your specific advices for future studies in this field.
- Figure 1 is a good idea to summarize study findings the part in the left side about Amblyopia treatment seems not bold, check visual representation of this figure.
- Finance and medical costs are other sides of the coin for this disease, I advise to add additionally information in this regard.
- To gain an additional insight about public health perspective, I advise author(s) to have look at following reference: Kalia et al. (2017) "Assessing the impact of a program for late surgical intervention in early-blind children" Public Health, 146, 15-23.
- I advise to give more specific answers to the main question of the study from the title which is: "How might we improve provision of care?"

To conclude, the design of the study is well organized and general flow of the ideas in the text is good. Additionally, there exist lack of knowledge in the text about cataract care in New Zealand and lack of concentration about public health. It is clear to say that, author(s) address very important topic and well organized the study. In the light of above comments, I think it needs minor revision, especially for discussion of the study findings.

I wish success and the best for author(s).

REVIEWER	Victoria Tseng, MD, PhD UCLA Stein Eye Institute Los Angeles, CA, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Aug-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This study addresses an important topic of pediatric cataract management. However, its current presentation especially with the lengthy Results section makes the study findings difficult to follow, especially with the phenomenological approach which may be unfamiliar to traditional audiences of scientific journals.</p> <p>Additionally, the authors' main conclusion is that pediatric cataracts are a complex medical issue requiring multidisciplinary management, and it is unclear if this is contributing new information to medical literature. If the manuscript is to be considered for publication, I would recommend the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Dramatic reduction of the length of the Results section so that readers can more easily follow study findings 2) Further in-depth description of the phenomenological approach and its specific role in scientific medical literature, including its strengths and limitations in this context 3) Specific details of new information that this study contributes to the medical literature on pediatric cataracts
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editor Comments to Author:

- Please include the location in the title. **Done**
- Please re-upload figure 1 under 'Image' file designation with at least 300 dpi resolution and at least 90mm x 90mm of width in either TIFF or JPG format.

Figure is currently a 225mm x 155mm, 300dpi TIFF

Reviewer(s) Reports:

Reviewer: 1

It look like the descriptive study in presenting the medical teamwork to improve the healthcare that is better that working independent. Congenital cataract has not been found often but has the impact both patients and their family.

Thank you.

Reviewer: 2

Congratulation. A very well designed and written study report. Will be a major contribution to other many on how to improve their eye care system.

Thank you.

Reviewer: 3

Firstly, I want to thank the author(s) pointing out this very specific topic. The manuscript is well written and gave a potential to contribute the literature about cataract care for children. Kindly, following sections include some of my suggestions to improve the contribution of study.

Thank you, we agree your suggestions have strengthened the manuscript.

Abstract section is well structured and well organized. It includes all parts of the manuscript.

- There is a need for more literature information for background section. I advise author(s) to add more literature information into the text about following topics:

Thank you for this note, we have incorporated more relevant literature (as per the additional comments below) into our introduction.

- It will be useful to provide more information about health system and the status of cataract care in New Zealand and also, I advise to discuss study findings while considering cataract care in New Zealand.

Excellent suggestion, thank you. We have incorporated this into the last paragraph of our introduction and discussion.

- It will be a good idea to give more information about health system, the level of child care in terms of public health perspective in New Zealand.

We hope we have covered this appropriately in the last paragraph of both our introduction and discussion.

- Put parenthesis before URL in page 6, line 111. Additionally, this link gives an error and it is not opening.

The URL has been deleted, as we can not be sure the updated one will remain active. The edit means that the issue with the parenthesis is no longer relevant.

- Avoid very short paragraphs like page 18, line 401, merge these sentences with above or below paragraphs.

Great suggestion, this has been incorporated into the above paragraph

- Cataract care for children is a very specific issue, I strongly advice author(s) to emphasize this issue as a strength of this study.

We re-worked the first paragraph of our introduction and conclusion to emphasize this

- I advise author(s) to give more specific advices from cataract care management perspective. What are the advices of author(s) for improving the efficiency of cataract care for children.

We have re-worked our discussion and conclusion to give more specific advice.

- It will be a good idea to emphasize the difference between cataract care for children between low income countries and high income ones, like New Zealand.

We have re-worked our introduction (first paragraph, as well as the second to last paragraph) and discussion to discuss differences (and similarities) between high and low income areas.

- The first sentence of the conclusion part not belongs to this section. It is a part of the literature review.

Thank you, we have removed this sentence.

I advise to give a very brief overview about the study. What this study adds to the literature and what are your specific advices for future studies in this field.

We have re-worked our discussion to add more specific advice, and emphasise what our project adds. We have also been more specific in the concluding paragraph.

- Figure 1 is a good idea to summarize study findings the part in the left side about Amblyopia treatment seems not bold, check visual representation of this figure.

The text in the figure in the amblyopia treatment section has been changed from grey to black.

- Finance and medical costs are other sides of the coin for this disease, I advise to add additionally information in this regard.

Although we agree this would be of interest, it is perhaps too broad a topic to address adequately in the current manuscript. Indeed one of our early themes was financial cost to the family, however, it was not common enough across participants to emerge as a central theme. This is something we would be interested to follow up on in a subsequent manuscript where we can do justice to the topic.

In this edit, we have added an approximate cost for surgery (estimated from 3 developing countries and in NZ) to our introduction (line 82), which we hope puts costs in context.

- To gain an additional insight about public health perspective, I advise author(s) to have look at following reference: Kalia et al. (2017) "Assessing the impact of a program for late surgical intervention in early-blind children" Public Health, 146, 15-23.

This is an excellent paper – thank you for pointing it out. We know the important work of this group well. We have incorporated this into our introduction, however, the since our cohort does not include any cases of late surgical intervention for dense bilateral cataract we do not feel that it should become a central part of our introduction or discussion.

- I advise to give more specific answers to the main question of the study from the title which is: "How might we improve provision of care?"

We have re-worked our discussion and conclusion to give more specific answers to this question.

To conclude, the design of the study is well organized and general flow of the ideas in the text is good. Additionally, there exist lack of knowledge in the text about cataract care in New Zealand and lack of concentration about public health. It is clear to say that, author(s) address very important topic and well organized the study. In the light of above comments, I think it needs minor revision, especially for discussion of the study findings. I wish success and the best for author(s).

Thank you for your considered review. We appreciate each comment, made substantial changes to the manuscript to address them.

Reviewer: 4

This study addresses an important topic of pediatric cataract management. However, its current presentation especially with the lengthy Results section makes the study findings difficult to follow, especially with the phenomenological approach which may be unfamiliar to traditional audiences of scientific journals. Additionally, the authors' main conclusion is that pediatric cataracts are a complex medical issue requiring multidisciplinary management, and it is unclear if this is contributing new information to medical literature. If the manuscript is to be considered for publication, I would recommend the following:

1) Dramatic reduction of the length of the Results section so that readers can more easily follow study findings

We have consolidated the results section as requested.

2) Further in-depth description of the phenomenological approach and its specific role in scientific medical literature, including its strengths and limitations in this context

We have amended our methods (end of page 8 to page 9), and our discussion (page 18) to address this concern.

3) Specific details of new information that this study contributes to the medical literature on pediatric cataracts

We have amended our conclusion to be more specific.

Additional notes:

To further improve the manuscript, we have made the following additional edits:

- 1) **We have adjusted theme names to keep grammar consistent**
- 2) **We have changed 'red eye reflex' to the more common usage of 'red reflex'**
- 3) **When making the reviewer's changes to Figure 1 we noted our ages were shifted in the original, so we have corrected this error.**
- 4) **If we noted grammatical errors on the read through we corrected them.**

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Songul Cinaroglu Hacettepe University
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Oct-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Revised version of the manuscript is acceptable.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Victoria Tseng, MD, PhD UCLA Stein Eye Institute
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Nov-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	All of my comments from the previous version have been adequately addressed. I believe the manuscript can be considered for publication.
-------------------------	--