

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Title (Provisional)

Domestic violence and older women's health in Latin American countries: A scoping review protocol

Authors

Macdonald, Marilyn; Palmieri, Patrick Albert; DOMINGUEZ-CANCINO, KAREN A.; Weeks, Lori E; Gallant, Allyson; Yakubovich, Alexa R; Langman, Erin; Ignaczak, Melissa; Mojibafan, Arezoo; Hammoud, Ali; Carrasco Salazar, Paulina

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

Reviewer	1
Name	Khuzwayo, Nelisiwe
Affiliation	University of KwaZulu-Natal, School of Nursing and Public Health
Date	14-Aug-2024
COI	None

Dear Authors,

Title: Domestic violence and older women's health in Latin American countries: A scoping review protocol

General comment: Women's health is a broad term. Can I request the authors to be specific? Which topic within women's health. The main research question is broad and can best be answered by the primary research. i have attached a detailed feedback for your attention

BMJ scoping review protocol review

Title: **Domestic violence and older women's health in Latin American countries: A scoping review protocol**

General comment: Women's health is a broad term. Can I request the authors to be specific? Which topic within women's health.

Specific Comments

1. Strength and limitation

It is not clear why the authors think that conducting their scoping review using the JBI methodology and using PRISMA-ScR guidelines are their strengths. They were expected to use them anyway since these are the approved frameworks for scoping reviews.

2. Introduction

The authors wrote definitions of terms underneath the introduction section. In the scoping review, the definition of terms is written in a standalone subheading labelled "definition of terms" Please revise accordingly.

Revise the introduction to give a global picture of your research area.

3. Review rationale: this is normally embedded in the introduction/background; please summarize the background to at least 1 ½ pages.

Methodology

The methodology requires major revision. The authors must use a framework that consists of six stages. The current methodology doesn't follow any of the scoping review frameworks. Some subheadings are visible, but they are not presented step-by-step.

5. information sources: Scoping review frameworks have no subheadings like this.

-Review question

Main question: Line 179: What is known about DV among women at midlife and older in Latin American countries?

- Abbreviations in a review question must be avoided.
- This review question doesn't necessarily require a scoping review since scoping is conducted to identify research gaps to pave for future research. This question can be best applied in a primary research study. Rephrase the question
- The authors included women's health in the title; however, the main research question doesn't include women's health; please explain why.
-

Sub-review questions: None of the questions are linked to the title or the main review question.

As per the main review question, I expected different questions from the ones the authors included. For instance, some of the questions will be

Types of DV violence experienced by women and factors influencing DV among women of LAC origin.

I am unsure what the Authors will do with this information gathered around the following review question: how do LAC define DV?

Researchers normally adapt the definitions from the World Health Organization, CDC, UNAIDS, etc.

Scoping reviews are conducted to learn the research gaps in the literature. The researchers want to map evidence of DV in terms of the types and factors. Can I request the authors to review and download a recent public scoping review protocol from the journal?

The following sub-research questions are broad. They can produce five scoping reviews. Please revise. Authors are expected to have one broad question and unpack the broad question into specific review questions.

What is known about cultural tolerance and risk factors for DV in LACs?
-cultural tolerance is the risk factor for DV, why are the authors mentioning it specifically?

What DV supports or interventions exist, and how are they evaluated?

How is DV measured and reported?

What frameworks have been used to guide DV research in LACs?

What DV-related health consequences are reported?

There are repetitions between rationale and search strategy.

What are the illegibility criteria for the review?

What is the exclusion criteria?

Key search word search – pilot table is required

A sample data extraction table is required

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow diagram for updating screening is required

Reviewer	2
Name	Brzank, Petra
Affiliation	Hochschule Nordhausen, Dept. of Economic and Social Sciences
Date	28-Nov-2024
COI	I have no competing interests.

Please add any general health consequences that affect your target group as well as those you have already mentioned. (142 ff)

Due to their age and functional limitations, the possibilities for separating from one's husband are also fewer. (147)

Please specify the research question(s): for which group the knowledge is to be recorded: health professionals, affected women themselves, politics, science, etc. (178 ff)

VERSION 1 - AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
Title: Domestic violence and older women's health in	Title change	Health was removed to avoid limiting the

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
Latin American countries: A scoping review protocol General comment: Women's health is a broad term. Can I request the authors to be specific? Which topic within women's health.	Domestic violence and older women in Latin American countries: A scoping review protocol	review to a particular topic within health that may not capture what is relevant in the Latin American context.
Strengths and limitation It is not clear why the authors think that conducting their scoping review using the JBI methodology and using PRISMA-ScR guidelines are their strengths. They were expected to use them anyway since these are the approved frameworks for scoping reviews.	This statement was removed and replaced with the following: Interrater exercises were conducted with reviewers prior to commencing text and opinion and full text reviews and data extraction. We added that our team is multi-lingual to the second strength listed. The review title was registered with Open Science Framework (OSF) https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/SZMF7	
Introduction The authors wrote definitions of terms underneath the introduction section. In the scoping review, the definition of terms is written in a standalone subheading labelled "definition of terms" Please revise accordingly. Revise the introduction to give a global picture of your research area.	Renamed Glossary and presented in narrative form as follows: Abbreviations of key terms as they are used in this scoping review protocol. Domestic violence (DV), Healthcare Professionals (HCP), Intimate partner violence (IPV), Latin American countries (LACs), Peer review of electronic search strategies (PRESS) and Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR). The Joanna Briggs Institute no longer exists since being rebranded as JBI. We reviewed the introduction and concluded that it does capture the global picture. We begin with the domestic violence rate worldwide and move on to the countries specific to the review.	
Review rationale: this is normally embedded in the introduction/background;	We reviewed the introduction for relevance and redundancy and conclude that it makes the case for the proposed	Rationale is a sub-heading in the Introduction and was

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
please summarize the background to at least 1 ½ pages.	scoping review. We emailed BMJ open regarding the length of the introduction December 9, 2024. Response December 10 from the BMJ Open Editorial office – “I can confirm there is no word count for the Introduction section”.	removed because the introduction systematically builds the case/rationale for the review
Methodology The methodology requires major revision. The authors must use a framework that consists of six stages. The current methodology doesn’t follow any of the scoping review frameworks. Some subheadings are visible, but they are not presented step-by-step.	The methodology outlined in the protocol contains all the headings and captures the stages of the JBI methodology for Scoping reviews as per Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Khalil, H., Larsen, P., Marnie, C., Pollock, D., Tricco, A. C., Munn, Z. (2022). Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evidence Synthesis, DOI: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242 The stages are listed under comments. We will bold them and use uppercase lettering in the manuscript, so they are evident.	Introduction Methods Search Strategy Inclusion Criteria Participants Concept Context Types of sources Study selection Data Extraction Data Presentation Arksey & O’Malley (2004) used the six stages. There has been an evolution in review methods since then and our manuscript reflects the current JBI methods.
Information sources: Scoping review frameworks have no subheadings like this.	Page 9 – The heading Information Sources has been removed and the information incorporated with the search strategy.	
Main question: Line 179: What is known about DV among women at midlife and older in Latin American countries? - Abbreviations in a review question must be avoided. - This review question doesn’t necessarily require a scoping review since scoping is conducted to identify research gaps to pave for future research. This question can be best applied in a primary research study. Rephrase the question	DV replaced with domestic violence. The identification of research gaps is one purpose of a scoping review. Another equally important one is to “provide an overview of the state of evidence on matters that are emerging, poorly known, interdisciplinary, complex or dispersed across various methodologies. The goal of a scoping review is to address broader questions. The main purpose is to describe and map a body of literature in terms of characteristics and factors detailed by the review’s objective, question/s, and inclusion	Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Khalil, H., Larsen, P., Marnie, C., Pollock, D., Tricco, A. C., Munn, Z. (2022). Best practice guidance and reporting

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
<p>- The authors included women's health in the title; however, the main research question doesn't include women's health; please explain why.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Sub-review questions: None of the questions are linked to the title or the main review question.</p>	<p>criteria". (Reference in comments section)</p> <p>The main purpose of a scoping review is "to describe and map a body of literature in terms of characteristics and factors detailed by the review's objective, question/s, and inclusion criteria". (Reference in comments section)</p> <p>The word health has been removed from the title as outlined in response to the first comment. The main question and sub-questions are all directed toward domestic violence and will contribute to "providing an overview of the state of evidence on domestic violence in older women in Latin America that is emerging, poorly known, interdisciplinary, and complex". (Referenced above under comments)</p> <p>The review objective and question(s) flow from the Population – Concept – Context (PCC) (Reference under comments)</p> <p>The included questions are all linked to one or all the PCC.</p>	<p>items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evidence Synthesis, DOI: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242</p> <p>Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Khalil, H., Larsen, P., Marnie, C., Pollock, D., Tricco, A. C., Munn, Z. (2022). Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of</p>

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
		scoping review protocols. JBI Evidence Synthesis, DOI: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242
<p>As per the main review question, I expected different questions from the ones the authors included. For instance, some of the questions will be</p> <p>Types of DV violence experienced by women and factors influencing DV among women of LAC origin.</p>	<p>You are correct and it is anticipated that our sub-questions will tease out this information.</p>	
<p>I am unsure what the Authors will do with this information gathered around the following review question: how do LAC define DV?</p> <p>Researchers normally adapt the definitions from the World Health Organization, CDC, UNAIDS, etc.</p>	<p>The original terminology planned for this review was Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in older women in Latin American countries (LACs). The JBI Affiliate Group in Lima Peru is our partner on this review and counseled us that this terminology is not commonly used in LACs and that the more commonly used term is domestic violence. Our searches are focused on databases specific to LACs.</p> <p>You may be correct in stating what definitions are normally accepted (adapted) from WHO etc., however we wanted to remain open to the possibility that other definitions may be employed and that WHO and UN definitions are not specific to Latin American countries.</p>	
<p>Scoping reviews are conducted to learn the research gaps in the literature. The researchers want to map evidence of DV in terms of the types and factors.</p>	<p>The identification of research gaps is one purpose of a scoping review. Another equally important one is to “provide an overview of the state of evidence on matters that are emerging, poorly known, interdisciplinary, complex or dispersed across various methodologies. The goal of a scoping review is to address broader questions. The main purpose is to describe and map a body of literature in terms of characteristics and factors detailed by the review’s objective, question/s, and inclusion</p>	<p>Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Khalil, H., Larsen, P., Marnie, C., Pollock, D., Tricco, A. C., Munn, Z. (2022). Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. JBI Evidence Synthesis, DOI: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242</p>

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
Can I request the authors to review and download a recent public scoping review protocol from the journal?	<p>criteria". (Reference in comments section)</p> <p>Two December 2024 scoping reviews were obtained from BMJ Open. One of which is; Harkess-Murphy, E., Tolson, D., Cheyne, J., Heron, S., Butler, A., Murray, Y., Mitchell, B., Limond, K. (2024). Trauma-informed family carer education and practical skills training in dementia: a systematic scoping review protocol. <i>BMJ Open</i>. 14:e090202. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2024-090202</p> <p>These authors use headings almost identical to those used in our review.</p>	<p>The Harkess et al. review uses the following headings: Introduction Review questions Eligibility criteria Participants Concept Context Types of Sources METHODS AND ANALYSIS Search strategy Study/source of evidence selection Data extraction Data analysis and presentation No mention is made of six steps. JBI methods require detail on the adjudication of sources for inclusion in three steps; title and abstract review, full text review, data extraction (all 3 steps involve two independent reviewers)</p>
<p>The following sub-research questions are broad. They can produce five scoping reviews. Please revise. Authors are expected to have one broad question and unpack the broad question into specific review questions.</p>	<p>The PCC is considered an appropriate framework for developing scoping review questions. (Peters et. al., 2022).</p> <p>There is one overarching review questions and the sub-questions relate to the various dimensions of domestic violence and mirror the information in the steps related to inclusion/exclusion criteria.</p>	

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
<p>What is known about cultural tolerance and risk factors for DV in LACs? -cultural tolerance is the risk factor for DV, why are the authors mentioning it specifically? What DV supports or interventions exist, and how are they evaluated? How is DV measured and reported? What frameworks have been used to guide DV research in LACs? What DV-related health consequences are reported?</p>		
There are repetitions between rationale and search strategy.	In using JBI methods it is required that a search for existing and related reviews is conducted. If any are found a description is required as well as the indication for the proposed review. The repetition used makes this clear and is minimal.	
What are the illegibility criteria for the review? What is the exclusion criteria?	Inclusion criteria are outlined on page 10 under participants, concept and context. Exclusion criteria are incorporated within.	
Key search word search – pilot table is required	We are unable to locate such a table in a sample of BMJ Open Scoping Protocols.	
A sample data extraction table is required	Table submitted with manuscript in July, 2024	
The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow diagram for updating screening is required	PRISMA-P submitted in July 2024.	
Reviewer 2		
Please add any general health consequences that affect your target group as well as those you have already mentioned. (142 ff)	In preparing the introduction the literature related to older women did not reveal this. We anticipate the review itself may provide this information.	

Reviewer 1 Comments	Author Responses	Comments as needed to add clarity
<p>Due to their age and functional limitations, the possibilities for separating from one's husband are also fewer. (147)</p> <p>Please specify the research question(s): for which group the knowledge is to be recorded: health professionals, affected women themselves, politics, science, etc. (178 ff)</p>	<p>Thank-you for this observation. It is an important one and something to look for in the review.</p> <p>We will be able to address this once we have a set of findings. We have added the following sentence prior to the review questions on page 8. We anticipate generating information from this review that is relevant to older women, healthcare professionals and decision and policymakers.</p>	

Addition of author Allyson Gallant – I failed to add Allyson Gallant at the time of our original submission. You will note these changes in the author list and in the contributions section at the end of the paper.