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Rochester, March 18, 2014

Editorial team

Systematic Reviews

RE: MS: 3594178921129960

Dear Editors,

Thank you for considering our manuscript entitled: A systematic review of shared decision making interventions in chronic conditions: a study protocol for publication in Systematic Reviews.

We are delighted to have the opportunity to respond to the editor’s comments on our manuscript. We have found their comments to be quite constructive and helpful in bringing our views to your readers with greater clarity.

We very much appreciate the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript with these revisions hoping that this version will meet the strict standards of your journal. Attached please find our itemized response to their concerns.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Gionfriddo
RESPONSE TO EDITOR

We are thankful for the editor’s constructive comments that helped to considerably improve and clarify the manuscript.

Editor’s report:

Consider using the term "review protocol" rather than "study protocol" in the title to facilitate electronic searches

The title has been changed per editor request.

Consider introducing the topic of shared decision making in the context of patient engagement (see e.g., Coulter & Ellis, Patient-Focused Interventions: A Review of the Evidence, Picker Institute Europe: The Health Foundation, August 2006)

The authors thank the editor for this suggestion and have added a statement about patient engagement in the introduction.

Consider adding the comparator to the aim of the study (effectiveness of SDM compared to what?)

Comparator has been added to the aim of the study per editor request.

Consider adding CINAHL to the list of databases to search

CINAHL has been added per editor request.

Screening references is different from hand searching, please revise the sentence

This sentence has been changed per the editor’s suggestion.

The Cochrane databases that will be searched should be specified (CENTRAL?)

The Cochrane databases to be searched has been clarified in the manuscript.

Reconsider the resolving disagreements by consensus in the title and abstract inclusion screening stage. The main aim is not to miss studies and you have to make decisions based on limited information, I would strongly suggest to order papers as full text when at least one of the reviewers sees potential

This has been changed based on the editor’s suggestion.

The strength of evidence assessment should be described. How will the body of evidence be evaluated, e.g., by applying GRADE, by considering the number of identified studies, the quality of included studies, the consistency of results across studies etc.
This section has been added and we thank the editor for this suggestion.