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)	Patients' experiences of cognitive impairment following critical
	illness: A scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Alrø, Anette Bjerregaard; Nedergaard, Helene; Svenningsen, Helle;
	Jensen, Hanne; Dreyer, Pia

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Darbyshire, Julie
	University of Oxford, NDC
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Oct-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The background and rationale for this scoping review are both
	explained well and the protocol is well written. I agree that a scoping
	review seems a reasonable approach to this topic. My only comment
	is that the sources listed in the search strategy are not particularly
	wide in scope and the authors may want to consider including 'grey'
	literature, commentaries, personal accounts of post-intensive care
	experiences, and recognise that published reviews could be a good
	source of studies not otherwise identified through their search. If the
	authors haven't already read this, they might find it useful:
	https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12
	874-018-0611-x

REVIEWER	Collet, Marie Copenhagen University Hospital, Intensive Care Unit 4131
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Dec-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The manuscript is a well described protocol for a scoping review.
	There are some minor revisions and considerations.
	It is not mentioned if any electronic or web-based software will be used to handle data or how to organize and handle either quantitative or qualitative data.
	The description of eligible criteria, literature search and inclusion and exclusion criteria could be demonstrated in a review Prisma flowchart as Feo et al.'s (2020).
	A plan of consideration of critical appraisal of risk of bias or quality assessment would increase the transparency and methodological rigour of the manuscript.
	PPI is mention as a not directly involved in this manuscript. But through a PhD program. It is not clear how PPI through a PhD program would benefit this manuscript.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Julie Darbyshire, University of Oxford Comments to the Author:

The background and rationale for this scoping review are both explained well and the protocol is well written. I agree that a scoping review seems a reasonable approach to this topic. My only comment is that the sources listed in the search strategy are not particularly wide in scope and the authors may want to consider including 'grey' literature, commentaries, personal accounts of post-intensive care experiences, and recognise that published reviews could be a good source of studies not otherwise identified through their search. If the authors haven't already read this, they might find it useful: https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x

Thank you for the recommendation of the article, we are aware of it. Thank you for your comments as well. Firstly, we describe (page 6), that unpublished studies and grey literature will be searched in Google Scholar. Secondly, we have added to the section types of sources (page 6): Besides, we will go through reviews' references to search for relevant and eligible studies.

Reviewer: 2

Mrs. Marie Collet, Copenhagen University Hospital Comments to the Author: The manuscript is a well described protocol for a scoping review. There are some minor revisions and considerations.

It is not mentioned if any electronic or web-based software will be used to handle data or how to organize and handle either quantitative or qualitative data. Thank you very much for that comment. We have revised the manuscript and added to the section 'data analysis and presentation', that The software programme NVivo 12.0 (QSR International Pty Ltd., Victoria, Australia) will be used to manage the qualitative and quantitative extracted data.

The description of eligible criteria, literature search and inclusion and exclusion criteria could be demonstrated in a review Prisma flowchart as Feo et al.'s (2020). Thank you for that recommendation. We are using Joanna Briggs guidelines for scoping reviews and therefore the Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram.

A plan of consideration of critical appraisal of risk of bias or quality assessment would increase the transparency and methodological rigour of the manuscript. Thank you for keeping focus on quality assessment. We also find it very important and have already included this in our protocol, but we might not have been clear enough about it. Therefore, we have revised the manuscript and added to both the abstract and the section about data extraction, that The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool will be used for critical appraisal of the included studies (25).

PPI is mention as a not directly involved in this manuscript. But through a PhD program. It is not clear how PPI through a PhD program would benefit this manuscript. Thank you for that comment. Knowledge obtained from this review will help researchers and clinicians obtain a more detailed understanding of how cognitive impairments affect patients, which is useful in the future planning of projects and when handling patients and families, who are at risk for developing cognitive impairments.

The section now reads: This scoping review is mapping existing research on patients' experiences of cognitive impairment following critical illness. Patients or the public will therefore not be directly involved in this scoping review. However, results from the scoping review as well as patient and public involvement will be used in ABA's PhD program with further explorative qualitative interview- and observational studies on patients' and relatives' experiences of cognitive impairments following critical illness in the ICU.