

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)	Domestic Abuse Sibling studY (DASY): a multi-method study protocol
AUTHORS	Donagh, Ben; Bradbury-Jones, C; Swift, Amelia; Taylor, Julie

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Caroline Piotrowski University of Manitoba Faculty of Health Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jun-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The proposed study addressed an under-studied and important topic. The multi-method approach that recruited practitioners, parents/carers, and siblings and included qualitative and quantitative methodologies were strengths of this study. See further comments below.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>The abstract was clear and well written. The description of the quantitative data analysis should not refer to the type of statistical package used but should refer instead to expected results for the four SRQ subscales.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Limited research on the impact of siblings exposed to domestic violence was cited, but recent work highly relevant to the present study was not mentioned; these should be included.</p> <p>Study Design</p> <p>It was unclear how members the Young Person Advisory Group members will be recruited, and if exposure to domestic violence with a sibling was an inclusion criterion for this group.</p> <p>Participant Recruitment.</p> <p>No information was provided concerning how frontline practitioners will be contacted for recruitment purposes.</p> <p>No information was given regarding how siblings of eligible age in families with more than two children will be selected.</p> <p>Data Collection:</p> <p>Practitioners will be encouraged to share anonymous case studies; however, it appears they will also be asked to describe their own sibling dynamics and experiences of growing up with DVA. Will practitioners be recruited on this basis?</p> <p>Completion of the questionnaire by sibling participants alongside the</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>primary researcher “who will ensure all questions are answered” may violate ethical protocols that allows participants to refuse to answer any question It may also be negatively perceived as overly intrusive by 12 to 17 year olds. How will literacy issues be addressed for those who cannot read the questions on their own?</p> <p>Data Analysis</p> <p>Thematic Analysis The Willig (2001) reference was not cited in the same style as the other citations and is not included in the references section.</p> <p>Qualitative Data Analysis No information was provided concerning how the Illustrative case studies mentioned in the abstract will be analyzed.</p> <p>Quantitative Data Analysis The list of variables shown in Table 2 did not represent variables from the SRQ-R, but instead listed basic demographic characteristics of the sibling participants.</p> <p>The study plans to recruit 20 sibling pairs; the quantitative data analysis plan should extend beyond descriptive statistics and the exploration of the assumptions of parametric tests to include examples of how the four SRQ subscales will be analyzed.</p> <p>The protocol lacked an explanation of an analytic approach concerning how qualitative and quantitative findings will be synthesized or integrated.</p> <p>Knowledge Transfer Information was lacking concerning how the age appropriate infographics for sibling survivors will be disseminated.</p> <p>KT strategies for findings based on practitioners and parents/carers were lacking; the frontline practitioner guides mentioned in the abstract were not addressed.</p>
REVIEWER	Nicky Stanley University of Central Lancashire
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Jul-2022
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is an interesting protocol for a study which has the potential to generate new knowledge on children and young people’s resilience to DVA and on risks and vulnerability factors. Sibling relationships and variations in impact among siblings have rarely been explored in the DVA literature but they need to be considered alongside other potentially influential factors such as gender, position in family and age (for instance, older adolescents are likely to be able to spend more time away from the family home and may therefore be less impacted by DVA). These factors need addressing in the account of the proposed analysis.</p> <p>The paper needs to consider the likely challenges for recruitment and informed consent/assent procedures – for instance, what procedures will be adopted if one child consents and another does not and how researchers ensure that children are under no pressure to assent even if their parent and sibling does so - and specify the time span and dates for the study.</p> <p>I thought that the descriptors of two of the key interview topics as: Young people’s/children’s experience of DVA and Sibling experience</p>

	<p>of coping and responding could have been distinguished more clearly. The interviews with young people are described on page 9 as 'sessions' but surely these are interviews in which a questionnaire will be completed and the photos discussed? The authors are clear that the protocol has not been funded but it would be helpful to know how the study itself is funded.</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Comments from Reviewer 1	
The abstract was clear and well written. The description of the quantitative data analysis should not refer to the type of statistical package used but should refer instead to expected results for the four SRQ subscales.	Thank you. We have removed the reference to the statistical package we will use and we have clarified the domains within the SRQ subscales.
Limited research on the impact of siblings exposed to domestic violence was cited, but recent work highly relevant to the present study was not mentioned; these should be included.	We have been able to find a few more studies relevant to our discussion, thank you. This can be found on page 4.
It was unclear how members the Young Person Advisory Group members will be recruited, and if exposure to domestic violence with a sibling was an inclusion criterion for this group.	The protocol now provides further clarity on this on page 5.
No information was provided concerning how frontline practitioners will be contacted for recruitment purposes.	This has been added to the protocol on page 6.
No information was given regarding how siblings of eligible age in families with more than two children will be selected.	The study is open to families of all sizes and there will be no restriction on the maximum number of siblings that can participate, if they meet the eligibility criteria. The protocol has been amended to clarify this on pages 6 and 7.
Practitioners will be encouraged to share anonymous case studies; however, it appears they will also be asked to describe their own sibling dynamics and experiences of growing up with DVA. Will practitioners be recruited on this basis?	Practitioners will be asked to share anonymous case studies of children they have supported, not themselves. When asked to describe sibling dynamics and experiences of DVA, this will also be relating to children they have supported and not their own experiences. This has been clarified in the revised protocol on page 8.
Completion of the questionnaire by sibling participants alongside the primary researcher "who will ensure all questions are answered" may violate ethical protocols that allows participants to refuse to answer any question It may also be negatively perceived	Thank you for highlighting this. We meant that young people will be provided the opportunity to answer all questions rather

as overly intrusive by 12 to 17 year olds. How will literacy issues be addressed for those who cannot read the questions on their own?	than being forced to answer them all. This has been clarified in the protocol on page 13, along with further insight into our support for children who may struggle with literacy.
The Willig (2001) reference was not cited in the same style as the other citations and is not included in the references section.	This has been corrected and can be seen on page 12.
No information was provided concerning how the illustrative case studies mentioned in the abstract will be analyzed.	The illustrative case studies will be gathered within the semi-structured interviews and will be analysed using thematic analysis. The protocol has been updated to clarify this on page 12.
The list of variables shown in Table 2 did not represent variables from the SRQ-R, but instead listed basic demographic characteristics of the sibling participants.	We have further clarified our planned approach to quantitative data analysis of the SQR responses on page 13 to address these pieces of feedback.
The study plans to recruit 20 sibling pairs; the quantitative data analysis plan should extend beyond descriptive statistics and the exploration of the assumptions of parametric tests to include examples of how the four SRQ subscales will be analyzed.	
The protocol lacked an explanation of an analytic approach concerning how qualitative and quantitative findings will be synthesized or integrated.	Data triangulation of the quantitative and qualitative data within this study will occur at the results interpretation stage. This will enable the study to understand whether qualitative findings coincide or differ from quantitative findings. This has been added to page 14.
Information was lacking concerning how the age appropriate infographics for sibling survivors will be disseminated.	The protocol's Knowledge Transfer section has been updated to offer further clarity on all aspects. This can be found on page 15.
KT strategies for findings based on practitioners and parents/carers were lacking; the frontline practitioner guides mentioned in the abstract were not addressed.	
Comments from Reviewer 2	
The paper needs to consider the likely challenges for recruitment and informed consent/assent procedures – for instance, what procedures will be adopted if one child consents and another does not and how researchers ensure that children are under no pressure to assent even if their parent and sibling does so - and specify the time span and dates for the study.	Thank you for raising this. We have addressed this thoroughly on pages 6 and 7.
I thought that the descriptors of two of the key interview topics as:	The key topics has been

Young people's/children's experience of DVA and Sibling experience of coping and responding could have been distinguished more clearly.	reworded to offer clarification on page 8.
The interviews with young people are described on page 9 as 'sessions' but surely these are interviews in which a questionnaire will be completed and the photos discussed?	Yes, that is right, this has been changed in the revised protocol.
The authors are clear that the protocol has not been funded but it would be helpful to know how the study itself is funded.	This study is forming part of a self-funded PhD. We have clarified this on page 18.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Caroline Piotrowski University of Manitoba Faculty of Health Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Sep-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors have conscientiously responded to prior feedback. Minor issues remain; please see further comments below.</p> <p>Abstract The abstract was clear and well written.</p> <p>Background The background section provided a strong rationale for the study, citing recent and relevant research. In the added paragraph on page 3, the phrase “sibling warmth play a predictive role” needs to be corrected.</p> <p>Methods and analysis The recruitment and data collection methods have been clarified. See Creswell (2014) for a helpful overview of analytic approaches concerning how qualitative and quantitative findings can be integrated.</p> <p>Knowledge Transfer The approach for ensuring relevant and appropriate knowledge transfer strategies was clarified.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Nicky Stanley University of Central Lancashire
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Sep-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors have responded to the bulk of reviewers' comments. Some minor issues remain to be addressed:</p> <p>Participant Recruitment – the challenges of this are now explored more fully. However, as written, the paper suggests that the parent could be interviewed without any interviews with children taking place or that one child could be interviewed without the other. Given the earlier statements about prioritising young people's views, this needs further clarification. On page 7, line 52, 'or non-consent' should be inserted after withdrawal. It would also be useful to clarify somewhere that consent will be sought from and provided by the non-abusive parent.</p> <p>The writing needs amending in a few places: Page, 5 line 30 – replace 'to play' with 'plays'</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Page 7, line 15 – insert with after ‘provided’</p> <p>Page 7, line 26 –replace with ‘young people’ with ‘young people’s’</p> <p>Page 7, line 29-31 – rewrite ‘to understand to what they are consenting when’ as ‘to understand what they are consenting to when’</p> <p>Page 12, line 6 and line 45 and elsewhere as appropriate - replace ‘young people participants’ with ‘young people participating’</p>
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Comments from Reviewer 2	
Participant Recruitment – the challenges of this are now explored more fully. However, as written, the paper suggests that the parent could be interviewed without any interviews with children taking place or that one child could be interviewed without the other. Given the earlier statements about prioritising young people’s views, this needs further clarification.	We have included further clarification on page 6. If any members within the family unit withdraws or does not consent (for example one of the siblings), the other members will be able to continue participating in the study as their individual insight will remain valuable to the study.
On page 7, line 52, ‘or non-consent’ should be inserted after withdrawal. It would also be useful to clarify somewhere that consent will be sought from and provided by the non-abusive parent.	We have made this addition as well as providing clarity around parental consent on page 6.
<p>The writing needs amending in a few places:</p> <p>Page, 5 line 30 – replace ‘to play’ with ‘plays’</p> <p>Page 7, line 15 – insert with after ‘provided’</p> <p>Page 7, line 26 –replace with ‘young people’ with ‘young people’s’</p> <p>Page 7, line 29-31 – rewrite ‘to understand to what they are consenting when’ as ‘to understand what they are consenting to when’</p> <p>Page 12, line 6 and line 45 and elsewhere as appropriate - replace ‘young people participants’ with ‘young people participating’</p>	Thank you for identifying these. All of the changes have been made.
Comments from Reviewer 1	
The background section provided a strong rationale for the study, citing recent and relevant research. In the added paragraph on page 3, the phrase “sibling warmth play a predictive role” needs to be corrected.	We have now corrected this sentence, thank you.
The recruitment and data collection methods have been clarified. See Creswell (2014) for a helpful overview of analytic approaches concerning how qualitative and quantitative findings can be integrated.	Thank you for sharing this, the overview is very helpful.