

Peer Review

Review of: "Redesign Considerations for a Person-Centered Nursing Home System"

Allison R. Heid¹

1. Independent researcher

I was drawn in by the topic of this commentary. The commentary proposes a need to redesign the system of care in nursing homes. It is an interesting read that contains some compelling arguments. However, the commentary would benefit from some reorganization of ideas to maximize understanding and impact.

1. Table 1 – I recommend restructuring this to list all 5 categories in the left column and then all the bullets in the right.
2. Page 4 – better clarity on what the authors mean by outcomes is needed: “Looking at the nursing home system’s outcomes...” – and then “The current nursing home system, producing undesirable outcomes...”. So far, the authors have outlined the challenges that are present, but no outcomes of these challenges. Here, if the authors mean challenges, then the text should be linked to the challenges articulated. If the authors do in fact mean outcomes of care, the paper would benefit from some further specification and description of outcomes.
3. I think the body of the paper would benefit from some reordering of ideas to better tie the ideas together and help with flow for the reader. The authors might consider the following: Provide the description under “understanding nursing homes as organizational systems,” then do the “A strategic approach” section, then the text “redesign based organizational principles” that starts with “Redesign requires adherence to organizational design principles...” thru to “(HOW we interact internally with our external stakeholders?).” Then, as a reader following this text, I was ready to read what these would/should look like for the Nursing Home System – so here, then move into the text that is under “Applying redesign principles to nursing home redesign.” Then conclude with the focus on leadership and the challenges that are inherent to this process. As it is written now, the

comments about leadership are in multiple places, and the challenges are in multiple places, so pulling them together would be helpful.

4. As a reader, I would recommend keeping the conclusions tightly tied to the focus of this manuscript and the arguments being made. For example, the first bullet point of “define and align purpose” is fine, but “adopt holistic management,” “implement effective governance,” and “encourage democratic engagement” felt a little bit out of the blue for me. To this point, the authors have been making the argument that redesign should focus on purpose, values, and simple rules. So I was expecting a conclusion to drive home these points of needing to centralize these elements to better design care. If the other bullet points are the key conclusions, then introducing those ideas earlier and more clearly would be helpful.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.