

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)	Implementation of robotic devices in nursing care. Barriers and facilitators: an integrative review
AUTHORS	Servaty, Ricarda; Kersten, Annalena; Brukamp, Kirsten; Möhler, Ralph; Mueller, Martin

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zohreh Schuessler Texas A&M University, USA
REVIEW RETURNED	06-Apr-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The following is in reference to the manuscript entitled “Implementation of robotic devices in nursing care. Barriers and facilitators: an integrative review” (ID bmjopen-2020-038650). The manuscript is organized, well crafted, and will provide further evidence on the topic. This manuscript has merit to be published with minor editions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 200 Table 1, the first column after “First Author”, the year of publication for all studies are missing or not showing in the print. For example, ROGOVE ET AL. [33]. - Line 181, the Covidence software needs proper intext citation and also needs to be listed in the reference list. - Table 3 provides a good summary of the findings. The epidemiology subdomain has been listed as a barrier and facilitator; it is not clear what the authors refer to. A short description would help. - For better organization, within the discussion section, a “Barriers” heading needs to be created as you have created for “Facilitators”. Also, the limitations section needs a heading. - Line 215-219, the number of crossed cells in table 3 does not match the number of (n) presented inline 215-219. - The number of crossed cells on table 3 in some cases, does not match the number of cited articles (articles under review) in the bracket in the text. This is evident in “Facilitators”, and “Barriers” sections starting line 224-284 and needs correction. -Line 290, “assigned” may not be the right word. Did you mean associated with? -Line 314, it sounds like you are reporting one of your study results. Consider changing “were frequently mentioned” to have been reported in the literature. Line 327-328 similar issue; consider changing “were criticized” to have been criticized by previous research. -Line 330, “It must be investigated in the future”, consider changing to future studies must investigate.....
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Irena Papadopoulos Middlesex University
-----------------	--

REVIEW RETURNED	13-Apr-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	I have enjoyed reading your article. I congratulate you for the clarity, rigour, accuracy, and simplicity of writing which makes the article very accessible not only to those with specialist knowledge for the topic and the methodology, but for everyone who wishes to learn more about the application of robots to healthcare and nursing. You have produced a very useful review of the literature which adds to the developing corpus of knowledge in healthcare robotics.
REVIEWER	Kannan Sridharan Arabian Gulf University
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jun-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	Nil.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Thank you for the detailed feedback, we have modified the manuscript according to your suggestions. We are very happy that you liked our work.

- Line 200 Table 1, the first column after “First Author”, the year of publication for all studies are missing or not showing in the print. For example, ROGOVE ET AL. [33].

→ The year of publication was added for all studies.

- Line 181, the Covidence software needs proper intext citation and also needs to be listed in the reference list.

→ The covidence software is now properly cited and listed in the reference list.

- Table 3 provides a good summary of the findings. The epidemiology subdomain has been listed as a barrier and facilitator; it is not clear what the authors refer to. A short description would help.

→ Thank you, we have added it in the text below. We hope, that it will make understanding better.

- For better organization, within the discussion section, a “Barriers” heading needs to be created as you have created for “Facilitators”. Also, the limitations section needs a heading.

→ Headings were added.

- Line 215-219, the number of crossed cells in table 3 does not match the number of (n) presented inline 215-219.

→ We have checked the numbers and revised where necessary.

- The number of crossed cells on table 3 in some cases, does not match the number of cited articles (articles under review) in the bracket in the text. This is evident in “Facilitators”, and “Barriers” sections starting line 224-284 and needs correction.

→ The numbers and cited articles were checked and revised.

-Line 290, “assigned” may not be the right word. Did you mean associated with?

→ Assigned was changed into associated with.

-Line 314, it sounds like you are reporting one of your study results. Consider changing “were frequently mentioned” to have been reported in the literature. Line 327-328 similar issue; consider changing “were criticized” to have been criticized by previous research.

→ The sentences were changed into proposed wording.

-Line 330, “It must be investigated in the future”, consider changing to future studies must investigate.....

→ The sentence was changed.

Reviewer: 2

Many thanks for your kind words and we are very pleased that you liked the article.

Reviewer: 3
Thank you for your time, reading our work.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Zohreh Schuessler Texas A&M University College of Nursing, United States
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Jun-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	The manuscript entitled “Implementation of robotic devices in nursing care. Barriers and facilitators: an integrative review” (ID bmjopen-2020-038650) is organized, well crafted, and easy to read. The authors implemented the suggestions that were provided to them. This manuscript will provide further evidence on the implementation of robots in healthcare and has full merit to be published as-is.

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dear Mrs. Schuessler,

Thank you for your appreciation of our work.