

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)	Does "Time Together" increase quality of interaction and decrease stress? A study protocol of a multi-site nursing intervention in psychiatric in-patient care, using a mixed method approach
AUTHORS	Molin, Jenny; Lindgren, Britt-Marie; Graneheim, Ulla; Ringnér, Anders

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Marianne Wyder Metro South Addiction and Mental Health Services, Brisbane, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	09-Feb-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a very interesting and needed study around introducing protected time on psychiatric inpatient wards the enhance therapeutic relationships between staff and patients. I look forward reading about the study results. It will be particularly important to look at facilitating but also at barriers to the implementation of this study. The lessons learned will have important implications for practice. particularly if protected time does not yield the desired outcomes and if different models of care are needed. I wish the authors success with this study.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Marianne Storm University of Stavanger
REVIEW RETURNED	08-May-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the study protocol 'Time Together: A study protocol of a multi-site nursing intervention project using a single system experimental design'.</p> <p>My overall comment is that the protocol is describing a welcoming and important intervention initiative in an area of healthcare that is difficult to conducted research and to achieve improvement in care quality. I particular like that the intervention is built on existing theoretical frameworks and will be tailored to local circumstances in the participating wards.</p> <p>I have the some comments (listed below) that I believe would benefit the protocol: There are relevant research studies from the Norwegian context by Storm et al. 2010, Storm & Edwards 2012, and Marit By Rise et al. and Solbjør et al. on user involvement in inpatient mental health care that will be useful for this research and also to present in the introduction.</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Research question one address contextual factors – I miss a reference and a clarification of contextual factors in the introduction. More details and explanation of the study design would be helpful, and a figure visualizing the study sites including key information on e.g number of staff, number of inpatients etc.</p> <p>There is no information of sample size estimated and the sample to be included in the questionnaire surveys. I also would like more information on the statistical methods and tests that are planned to be used.</p> <p>Additional limitations to the study design?</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1 – Marianne Wyder

Q: This is a very interesting and needed study around introducing protected time on psychiatric inpatient wards the enhance therapeutic relationships between staff and patients. I look forward reading about the study results. It will be particularly important to look at facilitating but also at barriers to the implementation of this study. The lessons learned will have important implications for practice. particularly if protected time does not yield the desired outcomes and if different models of care are needed. I wish the authors success with this study.

A: Thank you for your encouraging comments!

Reviewer 2 – Marianne Storm

Q: Dear editor, Thank you for the opportunity to review the study protocol 'Time Together: A study protocol of a multi-site nursing intervention project using a single system experimental design'. My overall comment is that the protocol is describing a welcoming and important intervention initiative in an area of healthcare that is difficult to conducted research and to achieve improvement in care quality. I particular like that the intervention is built on existing theoretical frameworks and will be tailored to local circumstances in the participating wards.

A: Thank you for encouraging comments!

Q: I have the some comments (listed below) that I believe would benefit the protocol: There are relevant research studies from the Norwegian context by Storm et al. 2010, Storm & Edwards 2012, and Marit By Rise et al. and Solbjør et al. on user involvement in inpatient mental health care that will be useful for this research and also to present in the introduction.

A: We have added one of these publications.

Q: Research question one address contextual factors – I miss a reference and a clarification of contextual factors in the introduction.

A: We have now clarified what contextual factors that we were aware of could play a role (see introduction). Still, the most important contextual factors in evaluation of a complex intervention, are probably the ones you didn't expect but discovered in the process evaluation.

Q: More details and explanation of the study design would be helpful, and a figure visualizing the study sites including key information on e.g number of staff, number of inpatients etc.

A: We have added a table describing the three intervention wards.

Q: There is no information of sample size estimated and the sample to be included in the questionnaire surveys. I also would like more information on the statistical methods and tests that are planned to be used.

A: As for the quantitative, single-system evaluation, we have further clarified why it is difficult to say a certain number of individuals in the methods section.

In general, hypothesis-testing statistical methods are not used in SSED research. The PND statistic, described in the analysis section, is often the method of choice in combination with visual analysis.

Q: Additional limitations to the study design?

A: We have tried to scrutinize the study design and write about possible limitations, such as the sample size and lack of standardization. Suggestions for other, more specific limitations to write about would be welcome.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Marianne Wyder Metro South Addiction and Mental Health Services
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Jun-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	I am happy with the changes made
-------------------------	----------------------------------