

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Emergency Nurses' Triage Narrative Data, Their Uses and Structure: A Scoping Review Protocol
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Picard, Christopher; Kleib, Manal; O'Rourke, Hannah; Norris, Colleen; Douma, Matthew J

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Joanne Turnbull University of Southampton
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	10-Nov-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a clearly written paper that outlines a protocol for undertaking a scoping review of triage narrative data in ED settings. The approach, rationale and methods of the review are clear and straightforward, standard and follow a recognised approach.</p> <p>My biggest issue with this protocol is that it is less clear on the implications, purpose of this research. The abstract and introduction needs a clearer statement about 'why we care' about this topic. In the introduction, there is a lot of text about what unstructured narratives are, the role of AI in studies of this nature, and previous review findings, but there is little about why this work is important / needed, what are the potential outcomes / implications of this work. A stronger justification is needed as to why this is a worthwhile piece of research.</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Harlan Sayles University of Nebraska Medical Center, Biostatistics
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	28-Dec-2021

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a very well written protocol for a scoping review of literature on studies of how triage narrative data from emergency nurses is structured and used. As such, I have only two minor points to offer:</p> <p>Line 84: Missing an "and" in the list before "non-English".</p> <p>Line 283: Just say "counts and percentages" since there is a 1-to-1 mapping between proportions and percentages. Also, I think the period after "percentages" is supposed to be a comma.</p>
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for the very thoughtful feedback, your observation is insightful and has helped not only to focus the purpose of the review but also to highlight components of the protocol that do not serve the advance the reviews objectives. The following edits have been made.

1. The argument in support of the value triage narratives being to estimating disease prevalence has been added on lines 147-154.
2. The justification for why a scoping review is needed (to inform potential systematic reviews and meta-analyses) has been added on lines 196-200 in order to align it with the existing stated goals of data synthesis on line 290-292. Edits to reflect this have also been made on line 106-108.
3. The intended purpose of the review is to map the peer reviewed literature and identify studies for future analyses. As such the grey literature review components has been removed. Edits to reflect this have been made on lines 81-83, 209-210, and 215-218. In addition the supplemental data extraction tables have been updated.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for the positive feedback and attentive review. The following edits have been made

1. The missing 'and" has been added on line 84
2. "Percentages and proportions" has been re-worded to "counts and percentages" and the stop has been corrected to a common on line 283.