

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)	'They could not see our eyes, they cannot see our faces, they do not know who we are and that is hard': a qualitative interview study with staff caring for children and families in a UK specialist children's hospital during the COVID-19 pandemic
AUTHORS	Aldiss, Susie; Gibson, Faith; Vindrola-Padros, Cecilia; Wray, Jo; Kelly, Paula

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Joseph , Hepsi Bai All India Institute of Medical Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Mar-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. This is a good study conducted by the research team2. The study has not mentioned any information about Rigour/trustworthiness, including credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability, which is needed as an essential aspect of a qualitative study.3. Data analysis information is lacking on what method/software was used, and how many codes arrived after initial and focus coding4. third research question is closed-ended.5. no information about arriving data saturation at which interview and termination of sample recruitment
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer comments:	
1. This is a good study conducted by the research team.	Thank you very much.
2. The study has not mentioned any information about Rigour/trustworthiness, including credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability, which is needed as an essential aspect of a qualitative study.	We agree that these elements are important aspects of a qualitative study however, due to word limits we are unable to describe these elements of our study in detail in this manuscript. When writing the manuscript we did aim to provide transparency in our reporting of our methods and analysis process. We have added some additional information to address rigour into the data collection and analysis sections.
3. Data analysis information is lacking on what method/software was used, and how many codes	We did not use any software. We have stated that we used team-based framework analysis and provided references for the approach used.

arrived after initial and focus coding.	<p>We have added in the number of themes in our initial framework and the number of themes/subthemes in our final analysis to the data analysis section:</p> <p>'Team reviews of RAP sheets led to the development of an initial coding framework by two researchers (SA, PK) which contained seven themes. This was further developed and refined with an in-depth examination of RAP sheets and review of interview transcripts, resulting in three themes and 10 sub-themes in total supported by illustrative quotes.'</p> <p>We have also reworked Figure 1 and added numbers to show the number of themes and subthemes more clearly.</p>
4. Third research question is closed-ended.	<p>The third research question is, 'Do staff experience any concerns delivering care in this context?' As this question was used to guide the study, we would like to leave it in its current form. We have provided the interview question schedule as supplementary material, the reader can see that the actual questions used in the interviews were not closed-ended.</p>
5. No information about arriving data saturation at which interview and termination of sample recruitment.	<p>This point was also raised in the editor's review, please see our response above.</p>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Joseph , Hepsi Bai All India Institute of Medical Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	17-May-2023
GENERAL COMMENTS	Corrections done.