

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics 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)	Parental views on attending neonatal intensive care ward rounds
AUTHORS	Greenough, Anne; Caldwell, Claire; MacBean, Victoria; Hunt, Katie

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Mandy Daly Institution and Country: Irish Neonatal Health Alliance, Ireland Competing interests: None
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>An important topic, well explored by the authors, the findings of which reflect the reality for every family with an infant in a Neonatal or Paediatric Unit. Given the immense stress experienced by families in this situation there is an increased likelihood of families misunderstanding the concept of ward rounds (as borne out by the finding that some families were unaware that they were allowed be present). Is it worth mentioning that how information pertaining to parental access to ward rounds is delivered to families could also be considered a limitation to participation?</p> <p>Encouraging to note that attitudes to parental involvement are changing (as a parent of an infant in the NICU in 2006 I am acutely aware of the journey) and that evidence supports the need to move towards inclusion.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Kristin C Voos Institution and Country: Rainbow Babies and Children's Hospital, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Associate Professor, Division of Neonatology. Director of Family Integrated Care Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. Director of Neonatal-Perinatal Medicine Fellowship Program. Cleveland, OH 44106 United States. Competing interests: None
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for your work in this area.</p> <p>I was a bit confused by the two different versions. I think the version that is redlined out is complete paper. But bc most of it was marked out I did not review this version in detail. But in general, Knowing what the structured interview included is important. The more detailed results gives a better picture of what parents responses were. Having the parent quotes adds a lot to this paper. I think the edited summary does not do the study justice.</p> <p>Looking at the shorter version I do not think the discussion gives a complete picture when you review a study about trainees concern for parents on rounds. There have been many studies in the literature that show the opposite or no difference. Not including both sides is misleading. Your longer version is more complete on this topic.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Overall I think this paper can add to the literature on this topic and parent views and opinions are important for how we practice. But I am concerned with the shorter version not being complete on the subject (background and discussion) as well as not really representing the study well (decreased results and no parent quotes).</p>
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

REVIEWER: 1

An important topic, well explored by the authors, the findings of which reflect the reality for every family with an infant in a Neonatal or Paediatric Unit. Given the immense stress experienced by families in this situation there is an increased likelihood of families misunderstanding the concept of ward rounds (as borne out by the finding that some families were unaware that they were allowed be present). Is it worth mentioning that how information pertaining to parental access to ward rounds is delivered to families could also be considered a limitation to participation?

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for their kind comments and have now included the limitation to participation suggested by the reviewer.

Encouraging to note that attitudes to parental involvement are changing (as a parent of an infant in the NICU in 2006 I am acutely aware of the journey) and that evidence supports the need to move towards inclusion.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

REVIEWER: 2

Thank you for your work in this area.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for their kind comment.

COMMENT: I was a bit confused by the two different versions. I think the version that is redlined out is complete paper. But bc most of it was marked out I did not review this version in detail. But in general. Knowing what the structured interview included is important. The more detailed results give a better picture of what parents' responses were. Having the parent quotes adds a lot to this paper. I think the edited summary does not do the study justice.

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer and, as requested by the Editor have modified the paper back to a full paper so as to include the information the reviewer suggests.

COMMENT: Looking at the shorter version I do not think the discussion gives a complete picture when you review a study about trainees' concern for parents on rounds. There have been many studies in the literature that show the opposite or no difference. Not including both sides is misleading. Your longer version is more complete on this topic.

RESPONSE: As above, we are now resubmitting the longer version which as the reviewer states is able to give a more balanced discussion with the larger word limit.

COMMENT: Overall I think this paper can add to the literature on this topic and parent views and opinions are important for how we practice. But I am concerned with the shorter version not being complete on the subject (background and discussion) as well as not really representing the study well (decreased results and no parent quotes).

RESPONSE: We thank the reviewer for these comments.