

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)	Essential Core Competencies for scope of practice of Paediatric Oncology Nurses in Latin America: a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	LOPES-JÚNIOR, LUÍS CARLOS; Lima, Regina Aparecida Garcia; Maia, Edmara Bazoni Soares; Ribeiro, Karina de Cássia Braga; Fuentes-Alabí, Soad; Sullivan, Courtney E.; Abraham, Monnie; Weber, Lorena Segovia; Ponce, Liliana Vásquez

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Martin-Misener, Ruth Dalhousie University
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol for a scoping review on core competencies for pediatric oncology nursing in Latin America. The protocol is clearly written, however, there are some conceptual and methodological issues that need to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It would be helpful to provide some background on the state of competency development in nursing in Latin America in the background section of the paper. Are there overarching competencies for nursing that apply to all specialties and how have these been developed, implemented, and regulated in practice? Providing this context would help readers who do not know much about nursing in Latin America to better understand the proposed protocol.2. Clarification of the purpose of the review is needed. Why is a scoping review needed at this time rather than another type of review? See Munn et al. BMC Medical Research Methodology (2018) 18:143 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x for helpful guidance on this.3. The research purpose is stated inconsistently at various places in the paper. For example, bottom of page 3 and top of page 4. It should be harmonized throughout the paper.4. What is the rationale for no date restriction on the search?5. Normally quality appraisal is not done in a scoping review. Why is quality appraisal of included studies in your review justified and how will it be helpful to achieving the purpose of the review? The paper by Munn referenced above speaks to this issue as well.6. Add a limitations section.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Khalil, Hanan La Trobe University, Department of Rural and Indigenous Health
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript, I have the following considerations for the authors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please consider using the most up to date methodology of the review. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews 2. There is no need to do a critical appraisal of the articles included in the scoping review. Best wishes
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Ruth Martin-Misener, Dalhousie University

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol for a scoping review on core competencies for pediatric oncology nursing in Latin America. The protocol is clearly written, however, there are some conceptual and methodological issues that need to be addressed.

1. It would be helpful to provide some background on the state of competency development in nursing in Latin America in the background section of the paper. Are there overarching competencies for nursing that apply to all specialties and how have these been developed, implemented, and regulated in practice? Providing this context would help readers who do not know much about nursing in Latin America to better understand the proposed protocol.

Response: OK. We have added this background on Introduction as per suggested. Thank you!

2. Clarification of the purpose of the review is needed. Why is a scoping review needed at this time rather than another type of review? See Munn et al. BMC Medical Research Methodology (2018) 18:143 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x> for helpful guidance on this.

Response: There are a number of reasons why a scoping review might be conducted. Unlike other reviews that tend to address relatively precise questions (such as a systematic review of the effectiveness of an intervention assessed using a predefined set of outcomes), scoping reviews can be used to map the key concepts that underpin a field of research, as well as to clarify working definitions, and/or the conceptual boundaries of a topic (Arksey & O'Malley 2005). A scoping review may address one of these aims or all of them. A scoping review of scoping reviews found that the three most common reasons for conducting a scoping review were to explore the breadth or extent of the literature, map and summarize the evidence, and inform future research (Tricco et al. 2016). The indications for scoping reviews are listed below: (Munn et al. 2018)

- As a precursor to a systematic review.
- To identify the types of available evidence in a given field.
- To identify and analyse knowledge gaps.
- To clarify key concepts/ definitions in the literature.
- To examine how research is conducted on a certain topic or field.
- To identify key characteristics or factors related to a concept.

3. The research purpose is stated inconsistently at various places in the paper. For example, bottom of page 3 and top of page 4. It should be harmonized throughout the paper.

Response: OK. We agree with you. We adjust in the same way as in the abstract.

4. What is the rationale for no date restriction on the search?

Response: The rationale is linked to the type of study we are proposing. We are interested in mapping the entire range of available literature on the scope of pediatric oncology nursing practices in Latin America, in order to outline recommendations for clinical practice, educational training and research settings in Latin America. Also because there is no previous systematic review on the subject. That's why we chose the scope review method, without date and language limits (which is the JBI 2020 recommendation, in order to avoid publication bias, citation bias, language bias that are common in review studies with limits of dates, databases and languages).

5. Normally quality appraisal is not done in a scoping review. Why is quality appraisal of included studies in your review justified and how will it be helpful to achieving the purpose of the review? The paper by Munn referenced above speaks to this issue as well.

Response: In fact, critical appraisal is mandatory for systematic reviews and according to the Manual for Evidence Synthesis, JBI, 2020 the critical appraisal item is optional. Since we are more interested at the moment in mapping all the evidence produced to date in Latin America around the topic than critically evaluating the studies itself, we decided to remove this part as suggested by Munn et al. Thank you!

6. Add a limitations section.

Response: Added.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Hanan Khalil, La Trobe University

Comments to the Author:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript,
I have the following considerations for the authors

1. Please consider using the most up to date methodology of the review. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews

Response: ok Done! We have updated for the Manual for Evidence Synthesis, JBI, 2020.

2. There is no need to do a critical appraisal of the articles included in the scoping review.
Best wishes

Response: In fact, according to the Manual for Evidence Synthesis, JBI, 2020 the critical appraisal item is optional. So, we decided to remove it as per suggested. Thank you!

Reviewer: 1

Competing interests of Reviewer: none

Reviewer: 2

Competing interests of Reviewer: None

The authors

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Martin-Misener, Ruth Dalhousie University
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Jun-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for your revisions to this manuscript.
-------------------------	--