

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)	A Qualitative Approach in Determining the Patient-Centered Information and Supportive Care Needs of Cancer Patients in Singapore
AUTHORS	Chua, Gek Phin; Tan, Hiang Khoon

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr. Janet Ellis Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	I feel this is a well written, thoroughly researched and valuable addition to the international literature regarding the supportive care, informational and quality of information delivery needs of patients, using a person-centred care lens.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Louise Soanes Teenage Cancer Trust University College NHS Foundation Trust, London
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	A clear paper that highlights consistent themes for the necessity of quality information delivered to patients in way they can use to meet their needs. The last two sentences of the conclusion are import and should appear in the abstract In presenting the themes the authors could reduce the number of quotes to ensure the findings are more apparent to the reader and the flow of information is less disjointed.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Yvonne Tran Macquarie University, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	The paper “A patient-centered approach in determining the information and supportive care needs of cancer patients” explored qualitatively the perceived needs of cancer patients undergoing treatment. From their open-ended questions, three themes were derived. The major issue is that the results seems to be listing and gathering common quotes for each theme identified but no synthesis or interpretation as to the meaning. -The title does not fully reflect the paper. It should be perhaps be a “qualitative approach” rather than a “patient-centered” approach. -The abstract only focuses on “information needs” whereas the paper is “information and supportive needs”.
-------------------------	---

	<p>- What does “baseline” mean in the context of this paper? (In abstract and introduction)</p> <p>-Research question covers the purpose of the study and intended outcomes, but what is new? There are already many papers investigating information and supportive needs and unmet needs, the authors need to indicate what their study adds to our current understanding. For example, from the results the cultural differences for information (need for TCM information) is different to current literature.</p> <p>-I think that the first two themes (with sub themes) identified are too general and do not add anything to the question of “what are the information and supportive needs for a patient-centred approach?” For the themes “the need for professional counselling” the authors chose three quotes identifying three different needs for counselling (patient and families, emotional support, support for information). There is opportunity for the authors to provide some interpretation regarding these.</p> <p>-The authors have grouped common quotes in the results section, however there has not been any analysis conducted with these quotes/themes. The current results are not appropriate for qualitative research. The work needs to be synthesised and interpreted. Some of this information can be found in the discussion section. The authors need to combine these discussion/ results section to appropriately address and provide analysis to the themes.</p> <p>-Rather than cover the very general findings, there is room to examine these open-ended response in much more depth. As it stands, the way in which the information has been interpreted does not seem to add to our current understanding on information and supportive needs for people with cancer.</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Comment	Response	Location in revised MS
Reviewer 1		
<p>I feel this is a well written, thoroughly researched and valuable addition to the international literature regarding the supportive care, informational and quality of information delivery needs of patients, using a person-centred care lens.</p>	<p>Thank you for the constructive review. The editor’s and reviewers’ comments have improved our manuscript.</p> <p>Thank you for the positive feedback.</p>	
Reviewer 2		

<p>A clear paper that highlights consistent themes for the necessity of quality information delivered to patients in way they can use to meet their needs.</p>	<p>Thank you for the constructive feedback and suggestions.</p>	
<p>The last two sentences of the conclusion are import and should appear in the abstract</p>	<p>Thank you. Change made. Due to word limit, we were only able to include the last sentence in the abstract.</p>	<p>Lines 28-30.</p>
<p>In presenting the themes the authors could reduce the number of quotes to ensure the findings are more apparent to the reader and the flow of information is less disjointed.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. We did a thorough review of the quotes but felt that the quotes are all relevant as they better support the themes revealed. However, we did some adjustments to the spacing and have merged comments from the same respondent together to make it less disjointed and highlighted them in purple.</p>	<p>Page 12-13 and page 18</p>
<hr/> <p>Reviewer 3</p>		
<p>The paper “A patient-centered approach in determining the information and supportive care needs of cancer patients” explored qualitatively the perceived needs of cancer patients undergoing treatment. From their open-ended questions, three themes were derived.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback.</p>	
<p>The major issue is that the results seems to be listing and gathering common quotes for each theme identified but no synthesis or interpretation as to the meaning.</p>	<p>Common quotes were listed to form a theme. Synthesis or interpretation of results can be found in the “discussion” section.</p>	<p>Lines 293-447</p>
<p>The title does not fully reflect the paper. It should be perhaps be a “qualitative approach” rather than a “patient-centered” approach.</p>	<p>Thank you for the feedback.</p>	
	<p>We have amended the title and it is highlighted in purple.</p>	<p>Title page.</p>

<p>The abstract only focuses on “information needs” whereas the paper is “information and supportive needs”.</p>	<p>Thank you for the constructive feedback.</p>	<p>Line 3 and line 10</p>
	<p>Amendments have been made to include supportive care that were inadvertently omitted and are highlighted in the abstract in purple.</p>	
<p>What does “baseline” mean in the context of this paper? (In abstract and introduction)</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the word “baseline”. It is a starting value of data obtained to compare subsequent measurements as they arise/ are being revealed.</p>	
<p>Research question covers the purpose of the study and intended outcomes, but what is new? There are already many papers investigating information and supportive needs and unmet needs, the authors need to indicate what their study adds to our current understanding. For example, from the results the cultural differences for information (need for TCM information) is different to current literature.</p>	<p>Thank you for agreeing that the research questions cover the purpose of the study and intended outcomes.</p> <p>Even though there may be many papers investigating information and supportive needs and unmet needs, we believe our findings do add to the body of knowledge that is currently lacking in Singapore. They further support and confirm with existing literature the challenges and concerns that cancer patients are facing while undergoing treatment.</p>	
<p>I think that the first two themes (with sub themes) identified are too general and do not add anything to the question of “what are the information and supportive needs for a patient-centred approach?”</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for the comment. Although the first two themes are general, we believe that our discussion has covered comprehensively the patient-centered approach to addressing these needs.</p>	
<p>” For the themes “the need for professional counselling” the authors chose three quotes identifying three different needs for counselling (patient and families, emotional support, support for information). There is opportunity for the authors to provide some interpretation regarding these.</p>	<p>We have analysed and reported these quotes/ themes in the “Discussion” section.</p>	<p>Lines 297-342</p>

<p>The authors have grouped common quotes in the results section, however there has not been any analysis conducted with these quotes/themes. The current results are not</p>	<p>We thanked the reviewer for the comments. We have synthesized, interpreted and</p>	<p>Lines 293-447</p>
---	--	----------------------

<p>appropriate for qualitative research. The work needs to be synthesised and interpreted. Some of this information can be found in the discussion section. The authors need to combine these discussion/ results section to appropriately address and provide analysis to the themes.</p>	<p>reported these quotes/ themes in the “Discussion” section.</p>
--	---

Rather than cover the very general findings, there is room to examine these open-ended response in much more depth. As it stands, the way in which the information has been interpreted does not seem to add to our current understanding on information and supportive needs for people with cancer.

Thank you for the feedback.

With all due respect to the reviewer, we believe that this point is not correct. We believe that our findings do add to/ support the body of knowledge with regard to the information and supportive care needs of cancer patients undergoing treatment especially on the aspect of TCM and food/ nutritional from a cultural perspective. Besides, strategies to address these needs were developed using a person-centred care lens. Moreover, we believe that the findings and strategies including the communication aspect would be helpful to healthcare professionals in their pursuit of delivering high quality care.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Yvonne Tran Macquarie University, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Dec-2019
GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have made the changes suggested. I have nothing further to add.