

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)	Integrated care for older people based on information and communication technology : a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Tian, Yutong; Zhang, Yan; Wang, Shanshan; Cheng, Qingyun; Meng, Lixue

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Rachelle Ashcroft University of Toronto
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>-This manuscript is a scoping review protocol that aims to examine and map out existing integrated models of care that include ICT. It is a timely topic with much attention on strengthening integrated care models in various locations, and will help inform integrated care in China. As well, it is timely given the focus on ICT/virtual care and older adults.</p> <p>A few comments to consider in order to strengthen the paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Review for integration of references, especially at specific data reference points-Overall review for grammar-States that integrated care is an approach to strength primary health care. Include a definition of primary health care-States that various models of integrated care are based on principles of multidisciplinary. Although some models are multidisciplinary in nature, many of the integrated care models go beyond multidisciplinary approaches and instead are based on interdisciplinary principles. Please address this gap in the paper.-The first research question seems to combine two aims: The first aim seems to be to analyse and synthesise existing service models of ICT-enabled integrated care; while the second aim relates to analyzing their effectiveness in practice. How is effectiveness in practice determined/defined? Does this mean that sources are those that have completed some form of evaluation? The latter part of the research question substantially narrows the potential sample that will be looked at, and could potentially limit inclusion of sources that would respond to the first part of the question.-The second question asks to identify potential barriers and facilitators to the implementation of different models. Consider revising the first research question so it specifically stipulates that it will identify and map out different integrated models. Consider revising the first question so there is better continuity between first and second research questions.-One of the core elements used for identifying integrated systems is: “a coordinated network across different levels and locations and
-------------------------	--

	<p>locations of the health, care and social service systems". Is this intended to say "... Locations of the health care and/or social service systems"? Please clarify this.</p> <p>-Also, the second core elements used to identify integrated care is "the formation of multidisciplinary teams to provide.... And palliative care". Consider changing to interdisciplinary teams, and, consider changing to "...and/or palliative care".</p> <p>-The third criteria to used to identify integrated care is "the provision of coordinated, continuum of care centred on older people". What criteria will be used to determine whether or not care is coordinated?</p> <p>-the search term "virtual care" should be included</p> <p>-the search term "interprofessional" should be included in Delivery of Health Care, along with "team based care". You may want to add "primary health care" to the search terms as it is currently missing.</p> <p>-Although Table 1 provides a list of entry terms, can be strengthened with the addition of the actual initial search.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	V Provencher Laval University
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Feb-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript (protocol)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: scientifically relevant and well structured. - Aim/Method/Results: Please further define the expected outcomes "effectiveness" - Discussion: Please underline the knowledge gap to be filled and add some limitations of the study. <p>Minor suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please remove the exclusion criteria pertaining to "duplication" (implicit to most studies, when mentioned in the method); 2) Please remove table 2 and include the content in the main text; 3) The study search seems quite large (1985-...) – authors should consider to narrow the years range (2000-); 4) line 45, page 10; please consider to change "AND" by "OR" (mixed methods...). 5) The authors are invited to demonstrate that they have the human/financial resources to perform an independent selection of the studies by two reviewers (e.g., by adding the initials of the two reviewers).
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1. Review for integration of references, especially at specific data reference points

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion, and we have revised each of them according to the reference format requirements of BMJ Open journal. See the reference section for details.

Comment 2. Overall review for grammar

Response: Thank you very much for your advice. This article has been edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English-speaking editors at AJE.

Comment 3. States that integrated care is an approach to strength primary health care. Include a definition of primary health care

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have already described in the first paragraph of the background that integrated care is an approach to strengthen primary health care and give a definition of primary health care. Please refer to the page 3 and line 11-18 for details.

Comment 4. States that various models of integrated care are based on principles of multidisciplinary. Although some models are multidisciplinary in nature, many of the integrated care models go beyond multidisciplinary approaches and instead are based on interdisciplinary principles. Please address this gap in the paper.

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestions, which helped me to further refine the comprehensiveness of the description. We have reviewed the literature to further clarify the similarities and differences between the principles of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinarity in integrated care, and have detailed them in the background section, as detailed on page 4, line5-10.

Comment 5. The first research question seems to combine two aims: The first aim seems to be to analyse and synthesise existing service models of ICT-enabled integrated care; while the second aim relates to analyzing their effectiveness in practice. How is effectiveness in practice determined/defined? Does this mean that sources are those that have completed some form of evaluation? The latter part of the research question substantially narrows the potential sample that will be looked at, and could potentially limit inclusion of sources that would respond to the first part of the question.

Response: We strongly agree with the reviewer's recommendations and have modified the first research question to focus on analyzing and synthesizing existing models of ICT-based implementation of integrated care services to broadly include relevant studies. In addition, we will integrate studies from the included literature that have completed practice evaluations to evaluate the effectiveness of ICT-based practice integration of care. See page 5, line18-19 for details.

Comment 6. The second question asks to identify potential barriers and facilitators to the implementation of different models. Consider revising the first research question so it specifically stipulates that it will identify and map out different integrated models. Consider revising the first question so there is better continuity between first and second research questions.

Response: With much appreciation for the experts' comments, we have revised the second question to "Identify potential barriers and facilitators to ICT-based implementation of integrated care models" to ensure continuity between the first and second questions. See page 5, line19-20 for details.

Comment 7. One of the core elements used for identifying integrated systems is: "a coordinated network across different levels and locations and locations of the health, care and social service systems". Is this intended to say "... Locations of the health care and/or social service systems"? Please clarify this.

Response: Many thanks to the experts for their suggestions. The original core elements focused on the coordination between different service providers/sectors in different locations such as in-hospital/out-of-hospital, home/community/hospital, etc., which were not clearly described. Therefore, we have further analyzed the definition of integrated care and redefined the core elements of the concept of integrated care in the context of the key principles of "holistic, multidisciplinary, and person-centered" integrated care, as described on page 7, line 3-11.

Comment 8. Also, the second core elements used to identify integrated care is "the formation of multidisciplinary teams to provide.... And palliative care". Consider changing to interdisciplinary teams, and, consider changing to "...and/or palliative care".

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions, and I agree with you very much. I have revised the second core element in the article, as detailed on page 7, line 6-9.

Comment 9. The third criteria to used to identify integrated care is "the provision of coordinated, continuum of care centred on older people". What criteria will be used to determine whether or not care is coordinated?

Response: Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion. The focus of this core element is to highlight the principle of "person-centeredness" of integrated care, which may be relatively general. Therefore, we have further elaborated the third core element in the context of the definition and key principles of integrated care. See page 7, line 9-11 for more details.

Comment 10. the search term "virtual care" should be included

Response: The valuable suggestions from the experts are greatly appreciated, and we further reviewed the definition of virtual care and found that virtual care contributed significantly to the

comprehensive search conducted for this study; therefore, we agreed to use virtual care as a search term in this study. For details, see Table 1.

Comment 11. the search term “interprofessional” should be included in Delivery of Health Care, along with “team based care”. You may want to add “primary health care” to the search terms as it is currently missing.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable suggestions, and we strongly endorse your idea and agree with the addition of the search terms "interprofessional care, team-based care". However, this study is intended to be included in any type of health care setting, including primary care, hospitals, emergency departments, or medical consortia. Therefore, we did not consider the inclusion of "primary health care" as a search term for the literature for the time being. See Table 1. for details.

Comment 12. Although Table 1 provides a list of entry terms, can be strengthened with the addition of the actual initial search.

Response: We are very grateful for the suggestions made by the experts, and we have combined the above comments to further supplement the search terms and conducted an initial search in the PubMed database, with the search formula and results detailed in the supplementary material.

Reviewer #2:

Comment 1. Aim/Method/Results: Please further define the expected outcomes "effectiveness"

Response: With many thanks to the experts for this question, we conducted a preliminary search of the existing literature and found that ICT-based integrated care services does not always produce positive results. Therefore, we have considered changing the word "effectiveness" to "effect". The changes are highlighted in red throughout the text.

Comment 2. Discussion: Please underline the knowledge gap to be filled and add some limitations of the study.

Response: Many thanks to the experts for their suggestions, and I have further added the significance, the knowledge gaps filled, and the limitations of this study in the discussion section, as detailed on page 15, line 2-8 and line 21-25.

Comment 3. Please remove the exclusion criteria pertaining to "duplication" (implicit to most studies, when mentioned in the method);

Response: We agree with you very much, and after discussion in the group, we have removed the exclusion criterion of "duplication". For details, see page 11, line 20.

Comment 4. Please remove table 2 and include the content in the main text;

Response: Many thanks to the experts for their suggestions, but we still considered a tabular presentation of the contents in order to make the extracted literature information clearer, so we decided to keep Table 2.

Comment 5. The study search seems quite large (1985-...) – authors should consider to narrow the years range (2000-);

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestions. We discussed carefully and decided to narrow the search to January 2000 to March 2022. For details, see page 8, line 28-29.

Comment 6. line 45, page 10; please consider to change "AND" by "OR" (mixed methods...).

Response: We strongly agree with the expert's recommendation and have changed "AND" to "OR". See page 11, line 14 for details.

Comment 7. The authors are invited to demonstrate that they have the human/financial resources to perform an independent selection of the studies by two reviewers (e.g., by adding the initials of the two reviewers).

Response: I am very grateful for the suggestions made by the experts, and I have described the human/financial resources available to this research team in the article, as detailed on page 6, line 4-13. In addition, I have added the initials of the two reviewers in the corresponding places in the article.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We adjusted the structure of the article according to the format requirements of the Journal of BMJ Open to make it more suitable for publication.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.