

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)	Substance use disorders among African Caribbean and Black (ACB) people in Canada: A scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Nguemo, Joseph; Iroanyah, Ngozi; Husbands, Winston; Nelson, LaRon; Maina, Geoffrey; Njoroge, Irene; Owino, Maureen; Kahan, Meldon; Miller, Desmond; Wong, Josephine

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lyndsay Alexander School of Health Sciences Robert Gordon University UK
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Jan-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the invitation to review this interesting scoping review protocol. There are some minor revisions required prior to acceptance for publication.</p> <p>My comments are:</p> <p>The PRISMA-P checklist (Moher et al 2015) should be followed and referenced here and the PRISMA-ScR checklist (Tricco et al 2018) should be referenced for final reporting of the review.</p> <p>The background section would benefit from a statement that no other reviews have been conducted on this topic or are currently underway. The abstract would also benefit from clarification and inclusion in the methods of the PICO and the research questions.</p> <p>There are inconsistencies between the abstract, research questions and text regarding the outcomes. Social impact is in the abstract and RQ2, but not background Research question 1 - perhaps consider sub-questions as this has a lot within it (also needs review for grammar).</p> <p>There needs to be an explicit PICO reported in the text that reflects table3 - currently there are differences. Population - consider adding in gender statement; Context - this is missing, add in Canada and be consistent to include this throughout the manuscript e.g. Canadian ACB; Outcomes - require clear representation in regard to these in the text and table 3. Table 1 - why is there repetition of ethnicity and location search terms? I'm unclear why this has been done and what it will add to the search results.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>The search strategy for Health Canada, Statistic Canada and the Canadian Centre on substance use and addiction are missing. Justification for limiting the search to English language would help as I wonder if French literature in Canada that are not retrieved/excluded in the review would affect results?</p> <p>Justification of limiting the search dates from 2000-2019 would also add rigour to this protocol.</p> <p>Table 4 - you state methodology but then list methods; are row 8 & 11 not the same? you have only considered one outcome (social) in the table - add in the rest; consider adding in an age demographic; how will you clarify between youth and adult? what reference for these will you use?</p> <p>Step 5 - you assume you will only retrieve quantitative and qualitative research, what about other designs such as text, opinion or systematic reviews? (you do state you will be fully inclusive to all designs)</p> <p>As per comment above - in Step 5 add in Canadian e.g. "synthesis will inform whether Canadian ACB...". also consider adding this to your limitations of the review i.e. limited only to Canadian context. also in dissemination, the findings will only be relevant to Canada.</p> <p>I would advise proof reading the manuscript throughout as there are grammar issues regarding "tense" used for words and some typos. in addition, please ensure all acronyms are written in full when first introduced.</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Krim Lacey University of Michigan-Dearborn Dearborn, Michigan, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Substance use disorders among African Caribbean and Black (ACB) people in Canada: A scoping review protocol (bmjopen-2019-028985)</p> <p>This review attempts to highlight the rather sparse, yet growing body of literature on African Caribbean and Black people residing in Canada. Overall, I would agree that this is a worthwhile endeavor given the complexity of substance use and the deleterious effects associated with it. Although I lean more towards acceptance of this article, it is perplexing that the literature is so limited surrounding the populations of focus. Thus, leading me to question the relevance of a review paper at this point. You will find below some comments regarding the article</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, the structure of the abstract seems to be appropriate. However, I would suggest that the introduction in this section pertaining to the purpose and scope of the article be slightly reduced to a sentence or two • In am not sure about the requirements of the journal, but perhaps a recommendation or conclusion section could be added
-------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since I am new to this type of reviews, I am unclear on whether the manuscript should be written in future tense as opposed to the past tense <p>Background Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, the authors provided an understanding of the problem and the need to investigate substance use • While I understood the need to provide a general understanding pertaining to the prevalence of drug use in general, it would also be helpful if the authors provided some demographic compositions of the population of focus • As previously alluded to, I felt the accumulation of literature is rather thin and not sure if this was by virtue of the rather little work done on this population in Canada. If there are other literature I would encourage the author(s) include them • The author(s) highlighted an article of a study using the CCHS. Is this study of ACB solely on those living in Ontario? If so, are there studies on those living in Canada in general? Even though these groups might be heavily concentrated in Ontario, they also occupy residency in other parts of Canada <p>Data and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated before, the authors stated their intention as opposed to what was done. It seems more like a proposal. I would assume the research would be more along the lines of what have they done? Again, this is what I am accustomed to • Otherwise, it appears that the author took the appropriate steps to carry out the study as outlined in the methods section of the manuscript <p>Results/Conclusion/Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I anticipated that there would be some discussion and conclusions drawn within text, but none was discussed. In my opinion, this would strengthen the paper and the arguments surrounding substance use among this population. • Perhaps a recommendation highlighting the direction for future studies would provide information on areas that is necessary as we move forward with the population of focus • As pointed out earlier, the others might consider including the limited literature on this population as a limitation and therefore the summary is inconclusive
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Lyndsay Alexander

Institution and Country: School of Health Sciences - Robert Gordon University - UK

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you for the invitation to review this interesting scoping review protocol. There are some minor revisions required prior to acceptance for publication.

My comments are:

The PRISMA-P checklist (Moher et al 2015) should be followed and referenced here and the PRISMA-ScR checklist (Tricco et al 2018) should be referenced for final reporting of the review.

Response: We thank the Reviewer.

We have revised the methodology. PRISMA-P checklist and PRISMA-ScR checklist have been referenced accordingly. p 4

The background section would benefit from a statement that no other reviews have been conducted on this topic or are currently underway.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

We have stated that “no other reviews have been conducted on this topic or are currently underway” in abstract and introduction. p 2&4

Revised accordingly

1.The abstract would also benefit from clarification and inclusion in the methods of the PICO and the research questions.

Response: We have revised the research questions in abstract and methods. p 2& 4-5:

This scoping review seeks to answer the following research questions:

- 1) What characterizes substance use disorders among ACB people in Canada?
 - What are the different types and prevalence of substance use among ACB people in Canada?
 - Do ACB people in Canada use more than one substance?
 - What factors are associated with substance use among ACB people in Canada?
- 2) What are the health and social impacts of substance use in ACB people in Canada

Also, the following PICO was formulated in methods. p 5:

- 1) Population: Canadian ACB people
- 2) Intervention: Study examines substance use
- 3) Comparison: Other ethnic groups if provided
- 4) Outcomes:
 - Types of substance use disorders
 - Prevalence of substance use disorders and poly drugs use
 - Health impact of substance use
 - Social impact of substance use
 - Factors associated with substance use

In addition, we have outlined the inclusion criteria in terms of the PICO. p 5-6

2. There are inconsistencies between the abstract, research questions and text regarding the outcomes. Social impact is in the abstract and RQ2, but not background

Research question 1 - perhaps consider sub-questions as this has a lot within it (also needs review for grammar).

Response: We thank the Reviewer for this comment.

The social impact of substance use has been provided in the background. P4

The research questions have been revised accordingly. (see above)

Revised accordingly

1. There needs to be an explicit PICO reported in the text that reflects table 3 - currently there are differences. Population - consider adding in gender statement; Context - this is missing, add in Canada and be consistent to include this throughout the manuscript e.g. Canadian ACB; Outcomes - require clear representation in regard to these in the text and table 3.

Response: Thanks.

Now, PICO reported in the text reflects table 4 (previous table 3). p5.

Table 4 has been revised and information on gender have been added.

Canada or Canadian ACB is now included throughout the manuscript

Outcomes have been revised in the text and table 4.

2. Table 1 - why is there repetition of ethnicity and location search terms? I'm unclear why this has been done and what it will add to the search results.

Response: We thank the reviewer.

We consulted the Librarian to develop our search strategy. We searched and scanned articles and abstracts, we discovered different key terms for ethnicity and location to enhance our search strategy. Using a systematic approach that included Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), free text words, phrases and truncated search for ethnicity and location, we were able to retrieve more relevant articles. So, repetition of these search terms (in different forms) yielded to more relevant articles

3. The search strategy for Health Canada, Statistic Canada and the Canadian Centre on substance use and addiction are missing.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for this comment.

The search strategy for these organizations has been provided in table 3.

4. Justification for limiting the search to English language would help as I wonder if French literature in Canada that are not retrieved/excluded in the review would affect results?

Response: We limit our search to English language due to the lack of language resources to review French articles. We understand that this is a limitation, but we think it would not affect the results. More importantly, articles published by Health Canada, Statistic Canada and the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction are in English and French, so we will not miss any information from the grey literature search.

This limitation was added in Strengths/limitations section. p 2

5. Justification of limiting the search dates from 2000-2019 would also add rigour to this protocol.

Response: We limited our search to articles published between 2000 to 2019 in order to include up-to-date articles while maintaining the more important goal of reliability. We recognized that this could

be a limitation; however, we have developed robust search strategy to retrieve as many relevant articles as possible

Table 4 - you state methodology but then list methods; are row 8 & 11 not the same? you have only considered one outcome (social) in the table - add in the rest; consider adding in an age demographic; how will you clarify between youth and adult? what reference for these will you use?

Response: We thank the reviewer.

Table 5 (table 4 before) has been revised to include health outcome, age demographic.

Based on the reference below, youth= 16-25 year. we will consider adult as >25 years.

Duff C, Puri AK, Chow C. Ethno-cultural differences in the use of alcohol and other drugs: evidence from the Vancouver youth drug reporting system. *J Ethn Subst Abuse* 2011;10(1):2-23. doi: 10.1080/15332640.2011.547791 [published Online First: 2011/03/17]

Step 5 - you assume you will only retrieve quantitative and qualitative research, what about other designs such as text, opinion or systematic reviews? (you do state you will be fully inclusive to all designs)

As per comment above - in Step 5 add in Canadian e.g. "synthesis will inform whether Canadian ACB...". also consider adding this to your limitations of the review i.e. limited only to Canadian context.

also in dissemination, the findings will only be relevant to Canada.

Response: We thank the Reviewer.

Yes, we will consider all study designs.

We have revised step 5 as following:

"Rather than provide a quantitative synthesis of literature, as is typically the use of systematic reviews, this scoping review aims to summarise a wide range of findings regarding substance abuse disorders among ACB people in Canada. Therefore, we will provide a descriptive summary of the gathered articles including peer-reviewed articles, text, opinion or systematic reviews. The descriptive summary will contain the characteristics of included studies, such as the overall number of studies, types of study design, years of publication, characteristics of the study populations, and provinces where studies were conducted. In addition, we will summarize the study findings with respect to the outcomes and report any gaps that might require further investigation. Our synthesis will inform

whether ACB people in Canada experience disorders related to alcohol, tobacco, stimulants, depressants, hallucinogens, opioids, or cannabis. Also, our synthesis will inform whether ACB people in Canada use more than one drug at a time and, the health and social impacts of substance use". p6

In Strengths/limitations section, we have added that "This study is limited only to Canadian context and the findings will only be relevant to Canada" p. 2

I would advise proof reading the manuscript throughout as there are grammar issues regarding "tense" used for words and some typos. in addition, please ensure all acronyms are written in full when first introduced.

Response: Thanks. We have proofread our manuscript

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Krim Lacey

Institution and Country: University of Michigan-Dearborn - Dearborn, Michigan, USA

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Substance use disorders among African Caribbean and Black

(ACB) people in Canada: A scoping review protocol

(bmjopen-2019-028985)

This review attempts to highlight the rather sparse, yet growing body of literature on African Caribbean and Black people residing in Canada. Overall, I would agree that this is a worthwhile endeavor given the complexity of substance use and the deleterious effects associated with it. Although I lean more towards acceptance of this article, it is perplexing that the literature is so limited surrounding the populations of focus. Thus, leading me to question the relevance of a review paper at this point. You will find below some comments regarding the article

Abstract

- In general, the structure of the abstract seems to be appropriate. However, I would suggest that the introduction in this section pertaining to the purpose and scope of the article be slightly reduced to a sentence or two

Response: We thank the reviewer. The introduction has been revised as per your suggestions. p 2

- In am not sure about the requirements of the journal, but perhaps a recommendation or conclusion section could be added

Response: We thank the Reviewer for the comment. The conclusion is not recommended by the journal however we have added a discussion/ conclusion section. p 7

- Since I am new to this type of reviews, I am unclear on whether the manuscript should be written in future tense as opposed to the past tense

Response: Most of the protocols is written in future tense to show the methodology that will be used to carry the review.

Background Review

- In general, the authors provided an understanding of the problem and the need to investigate substance use

Response: Thanks. We appreciate your comment

- While I understood the need to provide a general understanding pertaining to the prevalence of drug use in general, it would also be helpful if the authors provided some demographic compositions of the population of focus

Response: We thank the reviewer.

We have revised the introduction and demographic data about compositions of the population of focus have been provided. p 3

- As previously alluded to, I felt the accumulation of literature is rather thin and not sure if this was by virtue of the rather little work done on this population in Canada. If there are other literature, I would encourage the author(s) include them

Response: We thank the reviewer

Our initial search found literature on the topic which was provided in the background p3 & 4. We hope our robust search strategy will yield additional publications that will be included in the final report.

- The author(s) highlighted an article of a study using the CCHS. Is this study of ACB solely on those living in Ontario? If so, are there studies on those living in Canada in general? Even though these groups might be heavily concentrated in Ontario, they also occupy residency in other parts of Canada

Response: Yes, the study mentioned was conducted in Ontario.

Our initial search did not locate any articles in other parts of Canada. But we hope that our robust search strategy will be able to capture articles published in other provinces.

Data and Methods

- As stated before, the authors stated their intention as opposed to what was done. It seems more like a proposal. I would assume the research would be more along the lines of what have they done? Again, this is what I am accustomed to

Response: We appreciate your comments. We stated our intention because it is the protocol that will be used to carry the review.

- Otherwise, it appears that the author took the appropriate steps to carry out the study as outlined in the methods section of the manuscript

Response: Thanks

Results/Conclusion/Discussion

- I anticipated that there would be some discussion and conclusions drawn within text, but none was discussed. In my opinion, this would strengthen the paper and the arguments surrounding substance use among this population.

Response: Thank for your comment. We added a discussion/conclusion to this protocol. P7

- Perhaps a recommendation highlighting the direction for future studies would provide information on areas that is necessary as we move forward with the population of focus

Response: We can anticipate that this study will provide evidence that will inform development of strategies for appropriate intervention, as well as policy and further research. This statement is added in conclusion. P7

- As pointed out earlier, the others might consider including the limited literature on this population as a limitation and therefore the summary is inconclusive

Response: We thank the reviewer; however, we can only draw this conclusion after we conduct this review

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	lyndsay alexander Robert Gordon University, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank for the revised manuscript. Your amendments have addressed all issues and present a clear scoping protocol
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Krim Lacey University of Michigan-Dearborn, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The review attempts to highlight the body of literature on substance use among African Caribbean and Black people residing in Canada. While the authors have addressed some early concerns, there are a few things that the article can benefit from. You will find below some comments regarding the article.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the introduction of the abstract section, I would caution the authors about making statements such as “no reviews have been conducted on this topic or are currently on the way.” It might be safe to say something such as, “this is the first known review conducted on these population”? • Another thing the author might include in the limitation of this section is that the literature is rather sparse on this population. This is optional, however <p>Background Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, this was the section I had some concerns with, as it pertains to the arrangement of information, as well as information included. • I could be wrong, but I don’t see the need for the information on line 84-91 beginning within “In 2015, about 13%.....” I would like to think that such information could be removed or integrating elsewhere that would compare the general estimates of substance use with the ACB populations. Instead, I would think it could be more appropriate to begin with the subsequent paragraph that highlight the ACB population in Canada since this is the focus of the paper. Another approach could be to start the background section with line 92-93 and continue with “In Western countries such as Canada, racialized.....” This of course the author(s) choice, however. I just felt the information could be rearranged to improve the way the information is conveyed.
-------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Also, I don't see the relevance for the information provided on the age of the Black population unless it is related to the use of substance. • I am unclear what us meant by "problematic use" (line 101) • On line 113, the authors could consider rephrasing the sentence by stating, "Substance use is associated with increased risk of developing other mental disorders....." • On line 117, the authors could consider replacing the word "different" with "specific" or "other" ethnic groups... • On line 120, the authors could simplify the statement by saying, "Previous observational study showed that" • I would recommend the authors revise "a considerable amount of crime..." • On live 134, "I would recommend the author(s) revise, "Substance use also increases risky sexual behavior...." Perhaps the authors might consider "substance use is associated with increased risky....." <p>Data and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated before, I am still wrestling with whether this section should be written in future tense as opposed to past tense (will vs. was). Customarily, it would be the latter? <p>Conclusion and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar concerns noted in the previous section
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We would like to thank the reviewers for careful reading of this manuscript and for the comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows

Abstract

- In the introduction of the abstract section, I would caution the authors about making statements such as "no reviews have been conducted on this topic or are currently on the way." It might be safe to say something such as, "this is the first known review conducted on these population"?

Response: We thank the reviewer. We have revised the statement accordingly

- Another thing the author might include in the limitation of this section is that the literature is rather sparse on this population. This is optional, however

Response: We thank the reviewer. We added this limitation at the end of the introduction (line 126)

Background Review

- Overall, this was the section I had some concerns with, as it pertains to the arrangement of information, as well as information included.

- I could be wrong, but I don't see the need for the information on line 84-91 beginning within "In 2015, about 13%....." I would like to think that such information could be removed or integrating elsewhere that would compare the general estimates of substance use with the ACB populations. Instead, I would think it could be more appropriate to begin with the subsequent paragraph that highlight the ACB population in Canada since this is the focus of the paper. Another approach could be to start the background section with line 92-93 and continue with "In Western countries such as

Canada, racialized....." This of course the author(s) choice, however. I just felt the

information could be rearranged to improve the way the information is conveyed.

Response: We thank the reviewer. The information in line 84-91, has been removed from the background section and we have rearranged the information in the background section.

- Also, I don't see the relevance for the information provided on the age of the Black population unless it is related to the use of substance.

Response: We thank the reviewer. The information about the age of Black population was removed from the background

- I am unclear what was meant by "problematic use" (line 101)

Response: "problematic use" is cannabis use that can likely lead to harm, abuse or dependence. This explanation was added in the background section. (line 88)

- On line 113, the authors could consider rephrasing the sentence by stating, "Substance use is associated with increased risk of developing other mental disorders....."

Response: we thank the reviewer. We have rephrased the sentence accordingly (Line 100)

- On line 117, the authors could consider replacing the word "different" with "specific" or "other" ethnic groups...

Response: we thank the reviewer. We have replaced "different" with "specific" (line 104)

- On line 120, the authors could simplify the statement by saying, "Previous observational study showed that"

Response: we thank the reviewer. We have revised the statement accordingly (line 107)

- I would recommend the authors revise “a considerable amount of crime...”

Response: Thanks. We revised the statement (line 113)

- On line 134, “I would recommend the author(s) revise, “Substance use also increases risky sexual behavior....” Perhaps the authors might consider “substance use is associated with increased risky.....”

Response: We thank the reviewer. We have revised the statement (line 120)

Data and Methods

- As stated before, I am still wrestling with whether this section should be written in future tense as opposed to past tense (will vs. was). Customarily, it would be the latter?

Response: We thank the reviewer however, as stated before, this paper is a protocol that describes every step of the review we are planning to undertake. we think this section should be written in future tense.

Conclusion and Discussion

- Similar concerns noted in the previous section

Response: Since this is a protocol, we think this section should be written in future tense