Author's response to reviews

Title: Prospective systematic review registration: Perspective from the Guidelines International Network (G-I-N)

Authors:

Philip J Van der Wees (vanderwees@hcp.med.harvard.edu)
Amir Qaseem (aqaseem@acponline.org)
Minna Kaila (minna.kaila@kolumbus.fi)
Guenter Ollenschlaeger (ollenschlaeger@azq.de)
Richard Rosenfeld (richrosenfeld@ag.e2.exmx.net)

Version: 2 Date: 9 December 2011

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear David,

Thank you very much for inviting us to submit a revised manuscript. We were happy with the proposed revisions and consequent have addressed the comments in the revised manuscript. Changes in the manuscript are highlighted, and a point-to-point response to the comments is listed below.

We hope that our revised manuscript will be accepted for publication in Systematic Reviews.

Best wishes

Philip van der Wees

Harvard Medical School
Department of Health Care Policy
180 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02115-5899
Telephone: 617-423-3423
Cell: 857-264-8997
Email: vanderwees@hcp.med.harvard.edu
Point-to-point response to comments on manuscript ‘Prospective systematic review registration: perspective from the Guidelines International Network (G-I-N)’

Reviewer: Wiley Chan

ABSTRACT: PROSPERO initiative is mentioned, but not defined here. It is defined in the 2nd paragraph of the Introduction. Since PROSPERO is the "prospective systematic review registration" that is the topic of the paper, that should be clearer.

We have clarified the PROSPERO initiative in the abstract.

PERSPECTIVE FOR COLLABORATION, first sentence: "systematic" appearstwice: "Because systematic new systematic reviews and using existing ones are essential..."

The first ‘systematic’ is deleted from the text.

CONCLUSION, first paragraph, 3rd sentence: the phrase "high systematic reviews" appears, but probably was intended as "high-quality systematic reviews."

We included ‘high-quality’ systematic reviews in the sentence.

THE ROLE OF SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS IN GUIDELINE DEVELOPMENT section, first paragraph, last sentence: weighing the balance of desirable and undesirable effects requires data or assumptions about typical values and preferences of the patients. This modification to the GRADE domains of strength of recommendations is being actively discussed within the GRADE Working Group. This important aspect of balancing benefits and harms may be worth mentioning.

We would like to thank the reviewer for this very valuable suggestion. We agree that assessing values and preferences of patients is an essential component of the literature review. We have added the following sentence: ‘Weighing benefits and harms also requires collecting empirical data and qualitative information about values and preferences of patients’.

Editor’s comments

Please clarify whether the AGREE instrument (page 5’Methodology for guideline development’ is now called AGREE II.

We added ‘AGREE II’ to the section on methodology for guideline development.