

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 in accessing HIV care for Francophone African, Caribbean and Black people living with HIV in Canada: A scoping review
AUTHORS	Djiadeu, Pascal; Yusuf, Abban; Ongolo-Zogo, Clémence; Nguemo, Joseph; Odhiambo, Apondi; Mukandoli, Chantal; Lightfoot, David; Mbuagbaw, Lawrence; Nelson, LaRon

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Qiang Xia New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Feb-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>In this paper, the authors reported the findings from their scoping review on barriers to HIV care among Francophone African, Caribbean and Black immigrant people living with HIV in Canada. Their method is sound and conclusions are appropriate.</p> <p>Specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The title of their study protocol is, "Barriers to HIV care among Francophone African, Caribbean and Black immigrant people living with HIV in Canada: a protocol for a scoping systematic review," and the title of this review article is, "Challenges in accessing HIV care for Francophone African, Caribbean and Black people living with HIV in Canada: a scoping systematic review." I would suggest the authors keep the wording consistent, e.g., barriers vs. challenges.2. The current abstract structure is for original research articles. The authors should use an abstract structure that is appropriate for systematic reviews.3. Page 2 Line 10/Page 5 Line 1: Typo: "English and French" should be "English or French".
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Sanaz Nosrat Lehman College, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Feb-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a manuscript on a scoping review of the challenges in accessing HIV care for Francophone African, Caribbean and Black people living with HIV in Canada. The protocol for this review was published in this journal previously.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <p>There is a discrepancy between the protocol search databases and the actual paper databases. There are 9 databases used for the search in the paper. However, the authors proposed that they would use 5 databases in their protocol. Was there any reason for this change? Did the authors face difficulty finding sources in their primary proposal?</p>
-------------------------	---

	In Figure 1, please include the reasons for excluding 230 studies initially. This information is useful for replicability of the work. Please spell out all abbreviation before using them. For example, "PHA" is not spelt out throughout the manuscript. For strength and limitation of the study, please write down a paragraph instead of bullet points. Also, it is very important that the main limitation of this paper is discussed as lack of research in this area. There are only 2 studies included in this review which makes it really hard to draw any conclusions and this point needs to be discussed thoroughly in this section.
REVIEWER	Saul Cobbing University of KwaZulu-Natal Durban South Africa
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Feb-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	Well done on a well written and important paper. Please see comments to attend to in the attached document – please contact publisher for this file.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

The title of their study protocol is, "Barriers to HIV care among Francophone African, Caribbean and Black immigrant people living with HIV in Canada: a protocol for a scoping systematic review," and the title of this review article is, "Challenges in accessing HIV care for Francophone African, Caribbean and Black people living with HIV in Canada: a scoping systematic review." I would suggest the authors keep the wording consistent, e.g., barriers vs. challenges.

Response:

The title of the manuscript has been changed to, "Barriers in accessing HIV care for Francophone African, Caribbean and Black people living with HIV in Canada: a scoping systematic review". See title page 1.

The current abstract structure is for original research articles. The authors should use an abstract structure that is appropriate for systematic reviews.

Response:

The appropriate abstract structure that is appropriate for systematic reviews has been used. See page 2, lines, 9,10 and 14

Page 2 Line 10/Page 5 Line 1: Typo: "English and French" should be "English or French".

Response:

"English and French" has been changed to "English or French" throughout the study. See page 2, lines 14 and page 5 line 17.

Reviewer 2

Methods:

There is a discrepancy between the protocol search databases and the actual paper databases. There are 9 databases used for the search in the paper. However, the authors proposed that they would use 5 databases in their protocol. Was there any reason for this change? Did the authors face difficulty finding sources in their primary proposal?

Response:

The primary proposal did mention 5 databases. However due to some difficulties in getting more relevant publications we have to conduct the search in 9 databases with the hope to get more studies.

In Figure 1, please include the reasons for excluding 230 studies initially. This information is useful for replicability of the work.

Response:

In Figure 1, 230 studies were excluded because they didn't meet the inclusion criteria of focusing on HIV or Francophone or ACB in Canada. These reasons are now included in the results section (page 7, line 30 and page 8, line 1) and Figure 1.

Please spell out all abbreviations before using them. For example, "PHA" is not spelled out throughout the manuscript.

Response:

All instances of 'PHA' have been replaced with PLWH (People Living With HIV) in the text. See page 9, lines 4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 20 and 22.

For strength and limitation of the study, please write down a paragraph instead of bullet points. Also, it is very important that the main limitation of this paper is discussed as lack of research in this area. There are only 2 studies included in this review which makes it really hard to draw any conclusions and this point needs to be discussed thoroughly in this section.

Response:

The strengths and limitations have been structured according to the editor's requirement. See page 3, lines 1-12. However the main limitation of the paper was expanded and included in the discussion section. Moreover the implications of the lack of research was discussed further. See page 12, lines 6, 7, 24-30; page 13, lines 1 and 2.

Reviewer 3

Well done on a well written and important paper. Thank you.

Please see comments to attend to in the attached document

Write in full, i.e. "two"

Response:

We have now corrected "2" to "two". See page 2, line 19.

"francophone": Capital F

Response:

We have now changed "francophone" to "Francophone" throughout the manuscript.

Search strategy for identification of studies Why 1990 explain briefly

Response:

The French Language Service Act was enacted in Ontario in 1990. We have now included this brief explanation in the manuscript. See page 5, lines 19 and 20.

Appendix: You may not be able to add this whole Appendix. Give a brief summary of the search terms employed eg. variations of the terms "migrants/immigrants"; "French/Francophone", etc - to add to the information you included above

Response: "Appendix 1" was removed from the manuscript. A brief summary of the search terms has now been used in the manuscript. The following terms in various combinations (and forms) were used for the search: "Emigrants and Immigrants" OR (french or francais or franco* or quebec*" OR "Africa* or African or Afrique or Africain*" OR "Caribbean" OR "Caribbean Region" OR "Health Care Quality, Access/ and Evaluation" OR "Health Services Accessibility" OR "HIV infections" OR "Seropositivity/Seroconversion" OR "Canada or Canad*" OR "Black Canadian". See page 5, lines 28-

30 and page 6, lines 1-3. The scoping review protocol was also referenced. The scoping review protocol was also referenced.

What was the grey literature accessed and why was this material excluded?

Response:

The grey literatures accessed were reports from Health Canada and community organizations. However the material was excluded because it was focused more on Language barriers and access to French Language health services but not on HIV and African Caribbean and Black in Canada. These excluded studies from grey literature have been highlighted and cited in the grey literature and results sections. See page 6, lines 10 and 11 and page 7, lines 28 and 29.

Fig. 1: Please include

Response:

Figure 1 has been added as a "pdf" figure file at the editor request and will be included in the manuscript following the Results section at page 8.

Appendix 2: I don't think you will be able to add an appendix of this length - you could add an abbreviated table of the info in Appendix 2

Response:

Thank you for calling attention on the length of Appendix 2 (now Appendix 1). We have now reduced the page number to 3 pages. However we couldn't proceed with an abbreviated version because the report of the information seemed truncated. Furthermore this appendix is now "Appendix 1" in the manuscript.

Bacharach's principle: Briefly explain this please

Response:

The spelling mistake in 'Bachrach's' was corrected. In addition, the 9 criteria were expanded upon. Please see page 8, lines 21-27.

PHA's: Write in full in the first instance. If it means Person Living With HIV/AIDS (as I think it does) you need to be consistent throughout the paper...earlier you use the acronym PLWH. Please check whole document

Response:

All instances of 'PHA' has been replaced with PLWH (People Living With HIV) in the text. See page 9, lines 4, 10, 11, 13, 17, 20 and 22.

Conclusion: You need more here - either in the conclusion or preferably in a separate "recommendations" section. What specific changes should be made to health policy for this population? What specific "more HIV research" needs to be done?

Response:

One example of a specific change to health policy was added to the manuscript. Please see page 13, lines 23-36.

The need for "more HIV research" was expanded and clarified. Please see page 13, lines 13-17.

Limitations: I would also address the low number of included articles (two). While this is not necessarily a limitation (as you followed the correct scoping method), you need to explain why this was the case.

Response:

We have now addressed the low number of included articles in the discussion. See page 12, lines 6, 7, 24-30; page 13, lines 1-2.

Well done on a well written and important paper.

Response:
Thank you.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sanaz Nosrat City University of New York, Lehman College
REVIEW RETURNED	29-May-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have addressed all of my concerns.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Saul Cobbing Department of Physiotherapy University of KwaZulu-Natal South Africa
REVIEW RETURNED	27-May-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	See attached document for comments and edits – please contact publisher for this file.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 3

See attached document for comments and edits

Response: We have now updated reviewer's edits and comments according to the journal requirement.

Reviewer: 2

The authors have addressed all of my concerns.

Response: Thank you