

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 Longitudinal Study of Episodic Disability Experiences of Older Women Living with HIV in Ontario, Canada
AUTHORS	Solomon, Patricia; O'Brien, Kelly; Nixon, Stephanie; Letts, Lori; Baxter, Larry; Gervais, Nicole

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr Jose Catalan CNWL NHS Foundation Trust Psychological Medicine South Kensington and Chelsea Mental Health Centre, 1 Nightingale Place Fulham Rd London SW10 9NG UK
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an excellent paper, building on earlier work by the authors, and addressing an important topic, that of the difficulties experienced by people ageing with HIV.</p> <p>The longitudinal nature of the investigation is a particularly good aspect, as most studies of this population tend to be cross-sectional.</p> <p>The section Dealing with Uncertainty is very interesting, as it refers to positive strategies used by the participants, a very useful point.</p> <p>Although this is a qualitative investigation, I wondered if adding some quantitative measures about mood (anxiety and depression) would have added to the value of the study. It is not a criticism of it, but a question arising in my mind when reading about the episodic nature of the difficulties, which made me wonder about its relationship to mood.</p> <p>A couple of minor quibbles: no information is given about who carried out the interviews, and it should be straightforward to clarify this point.</p> <p>No information was given about consent and ethical approval (see list above) but it should be easy to deal with this, as well as the question of supplementary information - not sure if that would be necessary here (see above list).</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Kenzie Mintus IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA
-----------------	---

REVIEW RETURNED	12-Feb-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This research explores episodic disability among older women living with HIV. The longitudinal, qualitative data are important contributions to the literature. The manuscript is well written and motivated and the analyses are appropriate given the research objectives. However, I have a few minor concerns/areas for improvement.</p> <p>1) The results section of the abstract is missing an important comma between disclosure and maintaining. Moreover, the results section of the abstract may benefit from rewording in general. It is difficult to follow.</p> <p>2) The methods would benefit from an explicit statement about IRB or ethical review.</p> <p>3) Throughout the results section, the authors refer to "many women" or "many felt." With ten participants, I would suggest stating the exact number or percentage (e.g., nine out of ten women...).</p> <p>4) The finding of "good days" and "bad days" may warrant inclusion of K. Charmaz in the discussion (see Charmaz, K. (1991). Good days, bad days: The self in chronic illness and time. Rutgers University Press.).</p>

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editorial Requests:

- Please revise your title so that it includes your study's setting. This is the preferred format for the journal.

We have revised the title to indicate that the study was conducted in Ontario, Canada.

- Along with your revised manuscript, please provide a completed copy of the SRQR checklist (<https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/>)

Completed form is attached.

- Please add an ethics statement to the methods section (we note that in the submission system you say

it was approved by the Hamilton integrated Research Ethics Board). Please also add a statement to the

methods confirming that you obtained written informed consent from participants.

We have added the appropriate ethics and informed consent sta

Thank you for this suggestion. We did not collect these data so are unable to include it in this manuscript. Issues related to anxiety and depression were revealed through our qualitative interviews and we agree that this is an important area to pursue in future work.

A couple of minor quibbles: no information is given about who carried out the interviews, and it should be straightforward to clarify this point.

We have clarified who conducted the interviews.

No information was given about consent and ethical approval (see list above) but it should be easy to deal with this, as well as the question of supplementary information - not sure if that would be necessary

here (see above list).

We have added the appropriate ethics and informed consent statements.

Reviewer: 2

This research explores episodic disability among older women living with HIV. The longitudinal, qualitative data are important contributions to the literature. The manuscript is well written and motivated and the analyses are appropriate given the research objectives.

Thank you.

However, I have a few minor concerns/areas for improvement.

1) The results section of the abstract is missing an important comma between disclosure and maintaining. Moreover, the results section of the abstract may benefit from rewording in general. It is difficult to follow.

Thank you for identifying this oversight. We have inserted the comma. We also included some additional punctuation and clarification in the abstract.

2) The methods would benefit from an explicit statement about IRB or ethical review.

As noted above we have added the ethics and informed consent statements.

3) Throughout the results section, the authors refer to "many women" or "many felt." With ten participants, I would suggest stating the exact number or percentage (e.g., nine out of ten women...).

Thank you for this suggestion. We have provided numbers where it will assist with the interpretation of the findings, while being mindful of avoiding "analytic overcounting" (Sandelowski, 2003). Also to address this concern we have minimized the use of "some" and "many" in the descriptions. We have indicated when only one or two women have described a certain phenomenon.

4) The finding of "good days" and "bad days" may warrant inclusion of K. Charmaz in the discussion (see

Charmaz, K. (1991). Good days, bad days: The self in chronic illness and time. Rutgers University Press.).

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dr J Catalan CNWL NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Mar-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	no further comments