

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)	Identifying harm reduction strategies for alcohol and drug-use in inpatient care settings and emergency departments: a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Curran, Janet; Somerville, Mari; Boulos, Leah; Caudarella, Alexander; Crowther, Daniel; Johnson, Catie; Wozney, Lori; MacPhee, Shannon; Sinclair, Douglas; Elliott-Rose, Annette; Jose, Caroline; Joudrey, Morgan

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jenkins, Emily The University of British Columbia, School of Nursing
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Aug-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this scoping review protocol on drug and alcohol related harm reduction strategies used in inpatient and emergency department settings. The protocol is well written and organized. It addresses a high priority topic that has, to date, been understudied. A couple of minor suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in describing the range of harm reduction strategies on p. 4, consider including substitution therapy, and 'safe supply'. - in the Types of sources section, I am curious about the decision to exclude evidence syntheses. Might these not be a helpful source of data, if available? - in the Information sources section, further details on the grey literature search would be helpful (or reference to an established approach such as provided by Godin et al. (2015) https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-015-0125-0)
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Hawk, Mary University of Pittsburgh
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an important topic and I believe the findings from this scoping review will provide not only fill a critical gap in the harm reduction literature, but will also offer important implications for practice. The paper is well-written and concise, and I have only a few minor comments.</p> <p>Abstract – Intro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing period at the end of the last sentence.
-------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider adding region being studied (“global harm reduction strategies”) to the intro, even though you do mention this in the methods. <p>Strengths and Limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor point, but I suggest removing the second use of the word “relevant” to the last bullet point under Strengths and Limitations as it is redundant. <p>Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional clarity is needed regarding the language around implementation strategies; I feel this term is being used a bit loosely. If you are seeking information around barriers and facilitators to intervention, then just say that. If you are specifically searching the literature on implementation science, which explicitly assesses and explores strategies used to implement harm reduction approaches, then I would be more explicit about that. In this case, you should also include some information in the background section on implementation science and also make sure your search terms are similarly reflective. Of note, while this review will be valuable either way, I hope you also look into the implementation research. I’m guessing there is not much out there on this topic, so I don’t think it will blow up your review, and it would highlight the need for further research in this area. • It’s great that you are planning to report on patient outcome measures. Does this mean only the types of measures that are used, or will you also report on actual outcomes in the literature? Since this is a scoping review, I suspect you’re only reporting on the measures used, not the actual outcomes; however, in the data extraction section it seems like the latter. This should be made clear throughout the paper. <p>Supp. Table 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding my note above, if you are indeed exploring implementation strategies, some search terms that capture references to implementation science are needed. • You might also consider including “substance use disorder” and “alcohol use disorder” in your search terms since studies that recognize terms such as “addiction” are pejorative are more likely to use this more appropriate language.
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 Comments	Authors’ Response
- in describing the range of harm reduction strategies on p. 4, consider including substitution therapy, and 'safe supply'.	Both these terms were added to the described range of harm reduction strategies in the introduction (pg. 4) and to the search strategy (supplemental).

<p>- in the Types of sources section, I am curious about the decision to exclude evidence syntheses. Might these not be a helpful source of data, if available?</p>	<p>e will not be including evidence synthesis, because to our knowledge none exist which specifically address our research questions. However, the reference lists of any evidence syntheses identified by our search will be reviewed for relevant articles. (pg. 6)</p>
<p>- in the Information sources section, further details on the grey literature search would be helpful (or reference to an established approach such as provided by Godin et al. (2015) https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-015-0125-0)</p>	<p>Thank you for the prompt to include reference to the Godin et al. article, which we do plan on using to inform our grey literature search approach. We have added this reference to this section (pg. 6).</p>
<p>Reviewer 2 Comments</p>	<p>Authors' Response</p>
<p>Abstract – Intro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing period at the end of the last sentence 	<p>A period has been added. (pg. 2)</p>
<p>Abstract – Intro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding region being studied (“global harm reduction strategies”) to the intro, even though you do mention this in the methods. 	<p>The abstract introduction was amended to reflect that “the scope of harm reduction strategies used globally within inpatient settings and EDs is unknown” (pg. 2)</p>
<p>Strengths and Limitations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor point, but I suggest removing the second use of the word “relevant” to the last bullet point under Strengths and Limitations as it is redundant. 	<p>This bullet point was removed to add an additional limitation sentence to this section (pg. 3)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional clarity is needed regarding the language around implementation strategies; I feel this term is being used a bit loosely. If you are seeking information around barriers and facilitators to intervention, then just say that. If you are specifically searching the literature on implementation science, which explicitly assesses and explores strategies used to implement harm reduction approaches, then I would be more explicit about that. In this case, you should also include some information in the background section on implementation science and also make sure your search terms are similarly reflective. Of note, while this review will be valuable either way, I hope you also look into the implementation research. I’m guessing there is not much out there on this topic, so I don’t think it will blow up your review, and it would highlight the need for further research in this area. 	<p>We have amended our research questions to reflect that we intend to investigate what harm reduction strategies have been used within inpatient settings and EDs, how these strategies have been implemented in these settings, the reported barriers and enablers to their implementation, and the commonly reported outcome measures used to evaluate harm reduction</p>

	<p>strategies and their implementation. (pg. 5)</p> <p>We have added an additional sentence to the introduction related to our knowledge of the current gaps in implementation science related to harm reduction strategies.</p> <p>See below for response related to implementation search terms.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's great that you are planning to report on patient outcome measures. Does this mean only the types of measures that are used, or will you also report on actual outcomes in the literature? Since this is a scoping review, I suspect you're only reporting on the measures used, not the actual outcomes; however, in the data extraction section it seems like the latter. This should be made clear throughout the paper. 	<p>We have clarified that we plan to describe only the types of reported outcome measures used and not the actual outcomes (pg. 5)</p>
<p>Supp. Table 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regarding my note above, if you are indeed exploring implementation strategies, some search terms that capture references to implementation science are needed. 	<p>The search strategy was designed to be broad enough to capture all studies related to harm reduction in our settings of interest regardless of study design, including those looking at implementation outcomes, so adding implementation science terms has been deemed unnecessary by the information scientist on our team.</p>
<p>Supp. Table 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You might also consider including "substance use disorder" and "alcohol use disorder" in your search terms since studies that recognize terms such as "addiction" are pejorative are more likely to use this more appropriate language. 	<p>"Substance use disorder" and "alcohol use disorder" are covered by line 36 of the MEDLINE strategy. The unfortunate reality is that while we recognize and agree that terms such as "addiction" are pejorative, we must include these terms in order to be as comprehensive in our search as possible.</p>