Reviewer’s report

Title: Health Professional Perspectives on Systems Failures in Discharge Planning and Transitional Care for Patients with Dementia and their Carers: A Qualitative Descriptive Study

Version: Date: 7 September 2015

Reviewer: Dagrunn Nåden Dyrstad

Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This paper deals with the important issue of transitional care for patients with dementia and their carers. The qualitative approach deals with the point of view of health professionals’ perspective. The article is well written with relevant research in the introduction/background section. However, the result section does not clearly show the analysis process. This means there are many and too long citations with few synthesis efforts. The citations are often written with local accent, which makes them difficult to read. The whole paper is rather verbose and will benefit of substantial editing, in terms of condensing the text in the result section, as well as in the discussion.

Background

Page 4, fourth paragraph, line 95-99: Background: The authors need to link better the role of the health professionals: Why is it important for their role to be studied?

Methods

The method section would benefit having several sub-headings like design, participants, data collection, ethics and data analysis.

Page 7, second paragraph, line 153 – page 8, line 186: Make sub-titles in the Method section -> Recruitment/Participants

Make a subheading called “Data analysis”. What happened to the raw material to arrive at the result section? To follow the analysis process, I suggest that a table should be inserted, showing the coding system with specific stages used to analyze the data; condensing and synthesizing the text. Just make a short one with some statements from both major themes, in order to see that the findings
are drawn from systematic analysis, rather than from preconceptions.

Results
Page 21, second paragraph, line 512-521 – citations too long, better explain – condensation.
Page 22, second paragraph, line 531 – 541 – citations too long, too much descriptions.

I think the results section is too long, quotes are used too frequently and they are too long. This makes the text difficult to read, please reduce the amount and frequency, and present the results in a more condensed and synthesized way. The whole result section consists of 14 pages and should be reduced with several pages, around half length.

Minor essential revisions

Title
First paragraph, Page 1, line 1-3: The title might be made shorter and then easier to read

Background
Page 5, first paragraph, line 98 – adverse event should be defined.
The last sentence in the background section (page six, last paragraph) is very long and mixed with another research, and the aim of this study. Please divide the sentence in two parts, briefly describe the study and define the aim better and more specific – why we need health professionals’ perspective? No research questions are mentioned. Did you have any?

Methods
Page 7, second paragraph, line 172-175: A too long sentence, try to make it shorter, or divide in two sentences.

Results
Page 16, first paragraph, line 378: Elderly -> older?
Page 17, third paragraph, line 413 –The NUM? – please explain abbreviations the first time they appear in the text
Page 17, last paragraph, line 426 – ACAT assessment? – please explain abbreviations

Discussion
The discussion section might be improved if more condensed and broken into subsections with short, informative headings as described in the BMC’s Instruction for authors.

Page 22, last paragraph – perhaps start the discussion with repeating the study aims?
Page 24, first paragraph, line 580 – 587 – is it your own opinions or the article referred to?
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