

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)	Alternative service models for delivery of healthcare services in high-income countries: a scoping review of systematic reviews (Protocol)
AUTHORS	Jessup, Rebecca; O'Connor, Denise; Putrik, Polina; Rischin, Kobi; Nezon, Janet; Cyril, Sheila; Shepperd, S; Buchbinder, Rachelle

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Peter Yuen The Hong Kong Polytechnic University
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Would be helpful to readers to define and elaborate a bit more on what is a "scoping review". The data extraction process is not too clear nor is the format of the data extraction form. Present examples of bubble charts would be useful.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Son Nghiem Centre for Applied Health Economics Griffith University Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Jul-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This protocol outline a systematic review of models for healthcare delivery in high-income countries. The topic is highly important and a good review is needed. My main comments are 1. Explain clearly why only evidence of delivery model in the past five years (2012-2017) needed to review? 2. Why focus on review evidence from trials? Reviewing healthcare service delivery models that are implemented in practices would provide valuable policy & practical implications
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1:

1. *Would be helpful to readers to define and elaborate a bit more on what is a "scoping review".*

The definition of a scoping review has now been provided on page 4 lines 88 – 91.

2. *The data extraction process is not too clear nor is the format of the data extraction form.*

A clearer explanation has been provided on page 8 line 174 to page 9 line 202. In addition, Figure 1 has been added to provide a visual overview and to make the process clearer. We have also added Table 1, which is the preliminary version of the data extraction form to be used in the scoping review.

3. *Present examples of bubble charts would be useful.*

Bubble charts are a common method for providing a visual overview of a large volume of data. The size of the bubbles in this case will provide a visual overview of the spread of data across EPOC categories. An example of explanation of a bubble chart is provided below for the reviewer, and a reference has been added on page 10 lines 222 – 223. As examples of bubble charts are readily available on the internet, an example was not provided in text.



Reviewer: 2

1. *Explain clearly why only evidence of delivery model in the past five years (2012-2017) needed to review?*

We want the review of the evidence and data about effects to be up-to-date. Reviews published before this time are highly unlikely to be up to date. This has been described in greater detail in the objectives statement page 6, lines 120 – 122.

2. *Why focus on review evidence from trials? Reviewing healthcare service delivery models that are implemented in practices would provide valuable policy & practical implications*

The scope of this review was determined by our funder and identified as a priority for investigation. Examining what is implemented in practice is also highly valuable. To this end this work complements a systematic review already underway in the partnership centre that aims to identify, synthesise and draw meaning from studies published within the last 5 years that measure the sustainability of interventions, improvement efforts and change strategies in the health system. The protocol for this

review was published in BMJ last year (1) and has now been referenced on page 5, lines 112 – page 6 line 115.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Peter Yuen College of Professional & Continuing Education The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Hong Kong
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Oct-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have addressed my earlier queries in a satisfactory manner.
REVIEWER	Son Nghiem Griffith University, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Oct-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	I happy with the revised version and the paper can be accepted for publication.