Reviewer’s report

Title: Action research study on advance care planning for residents and their families in the long term care facility

Version: 0 Date: 13 Aug 2019

Reviewer: Mary Turner

Reviewer's report:

This paper reports an action research study to develop a culturally appropriate interview guide for use in advance care planning, a topic that should be of interest to readers of the journal. I have suggested a number of amendments that would improve the paper, and I would encourage the authors to undertake the work required to bring it to a publishable standard.

The background section outlines a number of obstacles to ACP, but it is not clear why these particularly apply to residential care facilities rather than any other care setting. There is also no clear definition of advance directives (indeed the abbreviation 'AD' is used without explanation on p.3), and 'AD' and 'ACP' seem to be used interchangeably throughout the paper. On p.7 the term 'ACP directives' is used, but it is not at all clear what is meant by this. Advance care plans and advance directives are distinct concepts, and the confusion between them needs to be resolved.

The authors state that the findings from the first action cycle were discussed with the facility staff; were these staff therefore participants in the research? If so, they should be included in the number of participants.

There is a lack of rationale for some of the decisions taken about sampling; for example, why were 20 family members included and only 10 residents? Were only those residents with two family members included, and why? Why were multiple interviews undertaken with each participant? How many interviews were conducted in total? These issues need to be clearly explained.

The study inclusion/exclusion criteria should be stated clearly.

Although the study purports to use action research methodology, there seem to be two distinct groups of people: those who were interviewed, and those who conducted or discussed the interviews. Usually action research involves active participants who make changes to practice that are then evaluated. In this case, it is not clear how the interviewees were active participants in the research; this requires further explanation.

It is reported that the first author spent six months working in the facility prior to the research; did this raise any ethical issues related to role confusion (researcher versus care worker)?
Were any assessments of capacity to consent undertaken with the resident participants? If so, who undertook the assessments?

The findings section reports occasions where residents told the researchers something that was then communicated by the researchers to family members. This raises questions about confidentiality, and whether the confidentiality of the residents was breached.

Overall, the English is of a good standard, but there are a few errors that require correction, for example:

On p.7, the phrase 'The first cycles of the action was that the first author…' would be better expressed as 'In the first cycle of action the first author…'

In the section on ethical approvals, the word 'approached' is used - should this be 'approved'? Please ensure the whole manuscript is checked thoroughly for grammatical and typographical errors.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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