

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)	The process of pain assessment in people with dementia living in nursing homes: a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Overen, Caroline; Larsson, Maria; Hillestad, Adelheid; Eriksen, Siren

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bregola, Allan University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust
REVIEW RETURNED	04-May-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I have reviewed the manuscript bmjopen-2022-063230 entitled 'The process of pain management in people with dementia living in nursing homes: a scoping review protocol'. This is a research protocol for a literature review with additional analytical elements which provide singular importance for the literature in the area. I have made some comments.</p> <p>Please includes in the abstract that pain is due treated in dementia patients due to missing in identifying its symptoms. Please also highlight the context of nursing homes in the abstract, why managing pain in this population is relevant?</p> <p>Please provide a brief detail of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis plan in the summary.</p> <p>Introduction Also, the introduction lacks bringing the relevance of focusing this study in the nursing homes context.</p> <p>Methods The authors of the protocol could provide in more detail how the operations are going to be used as well which operations and the combinations.</p> <p>Any software used to remove duplications A more detailed qualitative and qualitative analyses plan is to be used.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	de Waal, Margot Leiden University Medical Center, Department of Public Health and Primary Care
REVIEW RETURNED	10-May-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Pain management in people with dementia in nursing homes is troublesome. I agree with the authors that it is an important study topic.</p> <p>After reading the manuscript, I am in doubt what the focus of the scoping review is, please clarify in the text. In the abstract the authors state that they want to focus on "integrating self-reporting</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>in the recognition, assessment, and evaluation of pain". But also, that the scoping review is a first step in developing "an intervention targeting systematic pain management" (bullets) or "a care model to facilitate pain management" (introduction). I do not understand why the review is limited to self-reporting or even to the communication of pain. Pain management encompasses far more topics, that might be needed for the intervention? (E.g. Brunkert et al. J Nurs Scholarsh 2020 Jan;52:14-22 or Akker et al. Healthcare (Basel) 2021 Jul 16;9:905.) On the other hand, the preliminary research questions and the search strategy are much broader (table 1, concept = pain management processes).</p> <p>Minor details</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the discussion with the reference group warrant ethical approval? - Page 8 line 29 explain '... and thus continuity of care'? - Why is 'Korsakov' included in the literature search (and not in table 2)? - Page 12 line 56: as key items of information are mentioned "study design, study population, and the assessment tool". Communication or self-report of pain is also a key item?
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1 Dr. Allan Bregola, University of East Anglia Comments to the Author:	
I have reviewed the manuscript bmjopen-2022-063230 entitled 'The process of pain management in people with dementia living in nursing homes: a scoping review protocol'. This is a research protocol for a literature review with additional analytical elements which provide singular importance for the literature in the area. I have made some comments.	Thank you so much for the encouraging assessment of our study.
Please includes in the abstract that pain is due treated in dementia patients due to missing in identifying its symptoms.	We have added one sentence about why pain assessment is challenging in people with dementia (line 35-36).
Please also highlight the context of nursing homes in the abstract, why managing pain in this population is relevant?	Two sentences have been added to highlight this message (line 34-36)
Please provide a brief detail of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis plan in the summary.	A brief detail of the analysis plan has been added in the summary (line 54-57)
Introduction: Also, the introduction lacks bringing the relevance of focusing this study in the nursing homes context.	We have added two sentences to address this issue (line 108-111 and line 129-131).
Methods: The authors of the protocol could provide in more detail how the operations are	We have added two supplementary sentences on how the PCC-framework will guide our search strategy

going to be used as well which operations and the combinations.	with different search terms for dementia (population), pain (concept of interest) and nursing home (context) and combine them with AND (line 208-211). The search will be performed in several databases: CINAHL, Embase, MEDLINE, and PsycInfo databases (line 203-204). We do not find it necessary to provide a more detailed presentation of the search strategy in the protocol paper. But this will be an essential part of the scoping review.
Any software used to remove duplications	A sentence that addresses how we will remove duplications has been added (line 225-227).
A more detailed qualitative and qualitative analyses plan is to be used.	A more detailed description of the analysis has been added (line 276-281).
Reviewer: 2 Dr. Margot de Waal, Leiden University Medical Center:	
Pain management in people with dementia in nursing homes is troublesome. I agree with the authors that it is an important study topic.	Thank you so much for this encouraging assessment.
After reading the manuscript, I am in doubt what the focus of the scoping review is, please clarify in the text. In the abstract the authors state that they want to focus on "integrating self-reporting in the recognition, assessment, and evaluation of pain". But also, that the scoping review is a first step in developing "an intervention targeting systematic pain management" (bullets) or "a care model to facilitate pain management" (introduction). I do not understand why the review is limited to self-reporting or even to the communication of pain. Pain management encompasses far more topics, that might be needed for the intervention? (E.g. Brunkert et al. J Nurs Scholarsh 2020 Jan;52:14-22 or Akker et al. Healthcare (Basel) 2021 Jul 16;9:905.) On the other hand, the preliminary research questions and the search strategy are much broader (table 1, concept = pain management processes).	Throughout the manuscript, we have clarified the focus of the scoping review (line 40-44, line 159-163).
Does the discussion with the reference group warrant ethical approval?	We believe that there is no need for ethical approval. We shall not collect personal information or health information. The group is put together by the nursing home management. If the reference group includes people who are not competent to consent, we will ensure permission from next of kin.
Page 8 line 29 explain '... and thus continuity of care'?	We agree that the use of Continuity of Care should be explained if used. CoC is not the main focus of the scoping review, and we do not use the term other places in the

	manuscript. The use of the term could create more confusion than clarification, and it is now removed.
Why is 'Korsakov' included in the literature search (and not in table 2)?	The various types of dementia are not included in table 2, only the groups that will be excluded. Alcohol-associated dementia/Korsakov will be included.
Page 12 line 56: as key items of information are mentioned "study design, study population, and the assessment tool". Communication or self-report of pain is also a key item?	This sentence has been changed to clarify (line 258-260).

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bregola, Allan University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Sep-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	Authors have addressed my comments.
REVIEWER	de Waal, Margot Leiden University Medical Center, Department of Public Health and Primary Care
REVIEW RETURNED	11-Sep-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for following my suggestions. It has increased the readability. I have no further comments.