

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)	Investigating the impact of stigma, accessibility, and confidentiality on STI/STD/HIV self-testing among college students in the United States: protocol for a scoping review
AUTHORS	Reeves, Jaquetta; Zigah, Edem; Shamrock, Osman; Aidoo-Frimpong, Gloria; Dada, Debbie; Batten, Janene; Abu-Ba'are, Gamji; Nelson, LaRon; Djiadeu, Pascal

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Stephens, Jacqueline Flinders University, College of Medicine and Public Health
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Dec-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The findings from this review will be useful in the planning of STI/HIV self-testing programs. I will be interested to read the findings identified by the authors once published.</p> <p>General: In future, please help reviewers by providing the manuscript in 1.5 or 2 line spacing. Referencing: Both Vancouver and Harvard styles are used. Please ensure consistency.</p> <p>Introduction: Line 16: Take care with the order items in sentences with lists. Please reorder the list so there is no ambiguity to: "... ectopic pregnancy, sterility, severe pelvic pain, and cancer of the vagina, penis, anus, or throat."</p> <p>Methods: Page 3, Line 47: Missing references for the Arksey & O'Malley text and the Levac text. Please provide. Page 3, Line 52: Missing reference for Peterson et al. Please provide. Page 4, Line 10: Update referencing from Harvard to Vancouver style. Page 4, Line 43: It is unclear if "Identifying sources" is a heading or a sentence stubb. Please correctly format or delete. Page 4, Line 51: Please correctly refer to the databases as OVID, not OVIDSP. Page 5, Line 13: Can the authors please clarify if title and abstract screening is being done by dual screened by two independent reviewers? Page 5, Line 35: Why are the authors using a Google Form for data extraction and not the built-in feature of COVIDENCE, which makes extraction very simple?</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Page 5, Line 48-52: What software will the authors use to perform their analyses? How will descriptive statistics be presented (n, %, range etc)? Will a qualitative data management software be used to organise data for the narrative synthesis?</p> <p>Can the authors provide more detail about the process for the synthesis of the qualitative data? What theory will guide the analysis (e.g. Grounded Theory, Framework Analysis)? What method will be used (e.g. thematic analysis, content analysis etc)? Will the identification of codes be inductive or deductive? Will the identification of codes and themes be done by at least two independent researchers? How will consensus be reached? Can the authors identify any potential limitations in their proposed methodology?</p> <p>Results: N/A</p> <p>Discussion: N/A</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Kazmi, Shahwar World Health Organization
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Dec-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thanks for submitting this protocol. The research questions, methodology and outcomes are clearly defined. My only concern is age restrictions of 18 to 26 years in inclusion criteria as many research even in US. Age restrictions in inclusion criteria would preclude many insightful research in this review. Hence, my suggestion is to revise age restrictions to include all studies which have sampled college students >18 years and there should not be any upper age limit.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1	Response
Dr. Jacqueline Stephens, Flinders University Comments to the Author:	
The findings from this review will be useful in the planning of STI/HIV self-testing programs. I will be interested to read the findings identified by the authors once published.	Thank you!
General: In future, please help reviewers by providing the manuscript in 1.5 or 2 line spacing. Referencing: Both Vancouver and Harvard styles are used. Please ensure consistency.	The manuscript is now provided in 1.5 line spacing and the Vancouver referencing style has now been used throughout the manuscript.

<p>Introduction: Line 16: Take care with the order items in sentences with lists. Please reorder the list so there is no ambiguity to: "... ectopic pregnancy, sterility, severe pelvic pain, and cancer of the vagina, penis, anus, or throat."</p>	<p>This sentence has been revised. The list of health consequences is reordered to avoid any ambiguity. See page 4, lines 12-14.</p>
<p>Methods: Page 3, Line 47: Missing references for the Arksey & O'Malley text and the Levac text. Please provide. Page 3, Line 52: Missing reference for Peterson et al. Please provide. Page 4, Line 10: Update referencing from Harvard to Vancouver style. Page 4, Line 43: It is unclear if "Identifying sources" is a heading or a sentence stubb. Please correctly format or delete. Page 4, Line 51: Please correctly refer to the databases as OVID, not OVIDSP. Page 5, Line 13: Can the authors please clarify if title and abstract screening is being done by dual screened by two independent reviewers? Page 5, Line 35: Why are the authors using a Google Form for data extraction and not the built-in feature of COVIDENCE, which makes extraction very simple?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arksey & O'Malley have now been referenced. See page 5, line 10. • Peterson & all has now been referenced. Please see page 5, line 14. • References have now been updated from Harvard to Vancouver style. See page 5, line 23. • Identifying sources has been deleted. • The OVID database has been now properly referenced. See page 6, line 21. • Yes, Title and abstract screening will be done in duplicate by two independent reviewers. "In duplicate, the authors EYZ, OWS, GAF and GRA will conduct all screening, data extraction, and quality assessment procedures. Disagreements will be resolved by consensus. Consensus that cannot be reached will be resolved by a third author who will arbitrate (PD, JR)". See page 7, line 7-10. • The google form extraction has been effectively used by our team in the past and has been advised by our experienced librarian at Yale University. However, we could still use Covidence if necessary.
<p>Page 5, Line 48-52: What software will the authors use to perform their analyses? How will descriptive statistics be presented (n, %, range etc)? Will a qualitative data management software be used to organise data for the narrative synthesis? Can the authors provide more detail about the process for the synthesis of the qualitative data? What theory will guide the analysis (e.g. Grounded Theory, Framework Analysis)? What method will be used (e.g. thematic analysis, content analysis etc)? Will the identification of codes be inductive or deductive? Will the identification of codes and themes be done by at least two independent researchers? How will consensus be reached?</p>	<p>The methodology of the narrative synthesis has been addressed. Please, see page 8, line 5-12.</p>

Can the authors identify any potential limitations in their proposed methodology?	
Reviewer 2	Response
Dr. Shahwar Kazmi, World Health Organization Comments to the Author:	
Thanks for submitting this protocol. The research questions, methodology and outcomes are clearly defined. My only concern is age restrictions of 18 to 26 years in inclusion criteria as many research even in US. Age restrictions in inclusion criteria would preclude many insightful research in this review. Hence, my suggestion is to revise age restrictions to include all studies which have sampled college students >18 years and there should not be any upper age limit.	Thank you! The inclusion criteria have now been revised to include all college students at or beyond the age of 18. See page 6, lines 4-5.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Kazmi, Shahwar World Health Organization
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Feb-2023
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you and all the best.