

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)	Support programs for parents of children with intellectual disabilities: A scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Marais, Janene; Wegner, Lisa; Mthembu, Thuli

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Roy, Ashok Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust, Psychiatry of Intellectual Disability
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Mar-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This project focusses on a neglected area of service provision especially in low and middle income countries and is therefore to be welcomed. The methodology is clearly explained and follows an accepted format. The inclusion of qualitative and quantitative studies is likely to produce a good quality of evidence to inform policy implementation and service development
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Kinnear, Deborah University of Glasgow, Institute of Health and Wellbeing
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Apr-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a very well written scoping review protocol. The authors have covered all areas and described in detail the proposed work which is very clear. I have no further comments.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Sonday, Amshuda University of Cape Town
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jul-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to review this. (The reviewer provided an attachment – contact publisher should you wish to see it.).
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1	
This project focusses on a neglected area of service provision especially in low and middle income countries and is therefore to be welcomed. The methodology is clearly explained and follows an accepted format. The inclusion of qualitative and quantitative studies is likely to produce a good quality of evidence to inform policy implementation and	No change is indicated by the reviewer

service development	
Reviewer 2	
This is a very well written scoping review protocol. The authors have covered all areas and described in detail the proposed work which is very clear. I have no further comments.	No change is indicated by the reviewer
Reviewer 3	
Strikethrough "treatments"	The word "treatments" has been replaced with "treatment" in line 117
Strikethrough "reviewers"	The word "reviewers" has been replaced with "reviewer" in line 211
Strikethrough "reviewers"	The word "reviewers" has been replaced with the word "review" in line 215
What if authors of papers do not respond, how will this be managed? Perhaps to include a one line here	"If authors do not respond to the request a decision to include or exclude the article based the information available." Sentence added in lines 234-235
Strikethrough "and read"	The duplication "and read" has been removed from line 258
Strikethrough "figure 1"	This comment has not been actioned as the comment from the editor has stated: <i>Please provide figure 1 caption at the end of your m</i>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Kinnear, Deborah University of Glasgow, Institute of Health and Wellbeing
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Sep-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	No further changes required.