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)	Adverse event reviews in healthcare: What matters to patients and their family? A qualitative study exploring the perspective of patients and family.
AUTHORS	McQueen, Jean M; Gibson, Kyle; Manson, Moira; Francis, Morag

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Smith-Merry, Jennifer The University of Sydney, Faculty of Health Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Feb-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a field that I'm really familiar with and when I was reading over the paper I was continually agreeing with what the participants had said and the comments that the authors had made about their findings. I think it was this that is the main critique of the paper - I'm not sure how this paper builds on previous work to present new and interesting findings. They definitely confirm what has been found before and that shows that the research was sound (and indeed the methodology was very sound and results presented clearly). However I am not sure this is enough. The paper, I feel (the editors may disagree), should be offering some new perspective. Results from studies going back 15 years (e.g. the Iedema et al study you cite) have said these same things over and over. If that is your point then make it clear, but if there is more that you want to say to build on this existing literature then highlight that more. Either way you need to bring in more of the big international studies on patient experience of adverse events, and perhaps patient centred care in general, to build on. The discussion was very much lacking in an engagement with this existing literature. Other than that it was a well written and concise paper which I enjoyed reading. Typo in methods line 41, p 7, sentence ends with 'by'.

REVIEWER	Kara, Areeba Indiana University School of Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Mar-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	It is good to see the progression of thought in healthcare- from whether patients and families should be involved in the adverse event review process - to how it should be done best. The authors interviewed patients and/or their families who were involved in a serious adverse event and asked them about their experience. A few clarifications: 1- Were there any incentives offered for participation? This is not clear in the manuscript currently.

	2- In the Demographics table please clarify that this is the employment status of the patient involved in the event 3- What definition of 'serious' event was used in the recruitment process? 4- Readers may appreciate a table summarizing recommendations for best practices around the involvement of patients and families in these reviews. My gratitude to the authors and to the patients and families willing to share their experience to advance knowledge.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

Comment	Response
Not sure how this paper builds on previous work to present new and interesting findings. Results from studies going back 15 years have said these things if that is your point then make it clear	Thank-you this is our point and why we feel it is important to publish. Despite all the research the participants we spoke to are still struggling to get their voices heard and redress the power balance in the review process. We have added comment to that effect in the discussion and what our paper does add now (in response to reviewer 2 comments) is clear recommendations on how to enact this in practice. This is something that is not clearly articulated in previous publications on this topic. See the addition of table 3.
Need to bring in more of the big international studies on patient experience of adverse events, and perhaps patient centred care in general. The discussion was lacking in engagement with the existing literature.	Thank you we have reviewed more of the existing literature on this topic and have added in references and discussion points to reflect the international literature and wider person centred movement. Case, J. , Walton, M. , Harrison, R. , Manias, E. , Iedema, R. & Smith-Merry, J. (2021). What Drives Patients' Complaints About Adverse Events in Their Hospital Care? A Data Linkage Study of Australian Adults 45 Years and Older. *Journal of Patient Safety, 17* (8), e1622-e1632. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0000000000000813. Harrison R, Birks Y, Bosanquet K, Iedema R. Enacting open disclosure in the UK National Health Service: A qualitative exploration. J Eval Clin Pract. 2017;23:713–718. https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12702

	We have drawn on person centred care more widely and cited the what matters to you movement which was published in 2012 and spread to over 49 countries important reference added to support the links made in the discussion Barry MJ Edgman-Levitan S (2012) Shared decision making – The pinnical of patient-centred care N Engl J Med 2012; 366:780-781 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1109283
Typo in methods line 41, p 7, sentence ends with 'by'.	This is now corrected thank you

Reviewer 2

Comment	Response
Were there any incentives offered for participation? This is not clear in the manuscript currently.	There were no incentives offered for participation and have made this clear in the manuscript. See Participant selection and participation
In the Demographics table please clarify that this is the employment status of the patient involved in the event	Added narrative to explain this in table 1 *employment status of participants
What definition of 'serious' event was used in the recruitment process?	Definition added as follows An adverse event is defined as harm to a patient because of health care and includes medication errors, missed diagnosis, system or medical device failure, an unexpected event causing harm requiring additional treatment, or resulting in death or psychological trauma.
Readers may appreciate a table summarizing recommendations for best practices around the involvement of patients and families in these reviews	Thank you this is a really helpful comment and we have added table 3 to clearly articulate our recommendations

1.WHO. World Alliance for Patient Safety, World Health Organisation Geneva: 2012 https://www.who.int/patientsafety/en/brochure_final.pdf

2.Rathert C, Brandt J, Williams ES. Putting the 'patient' in patient safety: a qualitative study of consumer experiences. Health Expect. 2012;15: 327-33
3.Wiig S, Haraldseid-Driftland C, Tvete Zachrisen R, et al. Next of kin involvement in regulatory investigations of adverse events that caused patient death: a process evaluation (Part I - the next of kin's perspective). J Patient Saf. 2021;17: e1713-e1718.
4.Cumberlege J. First do no harm: the report of the independent medicines and medical devices safety review. 2020. Available at: https://www.immdsreview.org.uk/downloads/IMMDSReview_Web.pdf

5.Ockeden D. Emerging findings and recommendations from the independent review of maternity services at the Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust. 2020. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/943011/Independent_review_of_maternity_services_at_Shrewsbury_and_Telford_Hospital_NHS_Trust.pdf
6.Bouwman R, de Graaff B , de Beurs D , et al. Involving patients and families in the analysis of suicides, suicide attempts, and other sentinel events in mental healthcare: a qualitative study in the Netherlands. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2018;15: 1104.
7.Moore J, Bismark M, Mello MM. Patients' experiences with communication and resolution programs after medical injury. JAMA Intern Med. 2017;177: 1595-1603.

8.Bakhbakhi D, Burden C, Storey C, et al. PARENTS 2 Study: a qualitative study of the views of healthcare professionals and stakeholders on parental engagement in the perinatal mortality review—from 'bottom of the pile' to joint learning. BMJ Open 2018;8: e023792.

9.Moore J, Mello MM. Improving reconciliation following medical injury: a qualitative study of responses to patient safety incidents in New Zealand [published online March 9, 2017]. BMJ Qual Saf. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2016-005804

10.O'Connor E, Coates HM, Yardley IE, et al. Disclosure of patient safety incidents: a comprehensive review. Int J Qual Health Care. 2010;22: 371-9.

11. Iedema R, Sorensen R, Manias E, et al. Patients' and family members' experiences of open disclosure following adverse events. Int J Qual Health Care 2008;20: 421-32.

12. Vincent CA, Coulter A. Patient safety: what about the patient? Qual Saf Health Care 2002;11: 76–80.
13. Merner B, Hill S, Taylor M. "I'm trying to stop things before they happen": carers' contributions to patient safety in hospitals. Qual Health Res 2019;29: 1508-18.
14. Health Improvement Scotland. Building a national approach to learning from adverse events through reporting and review: a national framework for Scotland 2019. Available at: file:///C:/Users/jeanm/OneDrive%20-%20NHS%20Scotland/Documents/PCC%20Master%20File/2.0%20CEIM/11.0%20Communication/20191216-AE-framework-4th-Edition.pdf
15. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res Psychol 2006; 3: 77-101.
16. Smith JA, Flower P, Larkin M. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research. London: Sage. 2009.

17. Medical Research Council. Principles and guidelines for good research practice. 2021. Available at: https://www.ukri.org/publications/principles-and-guidelines-for-good-research-practice/

18. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. Int J Qual Health Care 2007; 19: 349-57.

19. Gallagher TH, Waterman AD, Ebers AG, et al. Patients' and physicians' attitudes regarding the disclosure of medical errors. JAMA. 2003;289: 1001–1007

20. Mid Staffordshire Public Inquiry (2013) Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry. http://www. midstaffspublicinquiry.com/report
21. Lord MacLean (2014) Health Improvement Scotland The Vale of Leven Hospital Inquiry Report . http://www. valeoflevenhospitalinquiry.org/report.aspx

22. Case, J. , Walton, M. , Harrison, R. , Manias, E. , Iedema, R. & Smith-Merry, J. (2021). What Drives Patients' Complaints About Adverse Events in Their Hospital Care? A Data Linkage Study of Australian Adults 45 Years and Older. Journal of Patient Safety, 17 (8), e1622-e1632. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0000000000000813.
22. Berger Z, Flickinger TE, Pfoh E, et al. Promoting engagement by patients and families to reduce adverse events in acute settings: a systematic review. BMJ Qual Saf 2014;23: 548-55.23. Harrison R, Birks Y, Bosanquet K, Iedema R. Enacting open disclosure in the UK National Health Service: A qualitative exploration. J Eval Clin Pract. 2017;23:713–718. https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.12702
24. Barry MJ Edgman-Levitan S (2012) Shared decision making – The pinnical of patient-centred care N Engl J Med 2012; 366:780-781 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp1109283
(udate 19 onwards) Mental Welfare Commission for Scotland. Deaths during compulsory treatment orders survey 2021: https://www.gov.scot/publications/review-arrangements-investigating-deaths-patients-being-treated-mental-disorder/pages/4/
20. van Dael J, Reader TW, Gillespie A, et al. Learning from complaints in healthcare: a realist review of academic literature, policy evidence and front-line insights. BMJ Qual Saf 2020;29: 684-95.
21. Professional Standards Authority. Telling patients the truth when something goes wrong: Evaluating the progress of professional regulators in embedding professionals' duty to be candid to patients. 2019. Available at: https://www.professionalstandards.org.uk/docs/default-source/publications/research-paper/telling-patients-the-truth-when-something-goes-wrong---how-have-professional-regulators-encouraged-professionals-to-be-candid-to-patients.pdf?sfvrsn=100f7520_6

23. Myren BJ, Hermens RRPMG, Koksma JJ, et al. Openness to new perspectives created by patient participation at the morbidity and mortality meeting. Patient Educ Couns 2021;104: 343-51.
24. Reynolds T. Openness is catching. 2014. Available at: https://gmcuk.wordpress.com/2014/12/18/openness-is-catching/

25. Radhakrishna S. Culture of blame in the National Health Service; consequences and solutions. Br J Anaesth 2015;115: 653-5.

26. Foslien-Nash C, Reed b. Just Culture IS not 'Just' Culture – It's shifting mindset. Military Medicine 2020, 185, S3:52. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33002145/
27. McNab D, Bowie P, Ross A, Morrison J. Understanding and responding when things go wrong: key principles for primary care educators. Education for primary care 2016 27:4p258-266