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Author's response to reviews: see over
PRISMA-P 2015 Statement Peer Review Responses.

- There were 3 minor/discretionary comments from a single reviewer requiring a response. They are listed and addressed in the table below.
- Other minor changes were made (and track changed) to ensure that the PRISMA-P Statement paper is in line with the PRISMA-P 2015 E&E paper accepted for publication in the BMJ.
- Those changes consist of the following:
  - All instances of “PRISMA-P 2014” have been changed to reflect the planned publication in 2015.
  - A few group author affiliations have been updated.
  - A few citations have been updated to reflect correct formatting.
  - We have added a preliminary citation to the BMJ PRISMA-P E&E paper. We hope to have a final citation by the time of proofreading.
  - Minor changes have been made to the wording of checklist items 3b, 8, 9, 11a, 15b, 15d, and 17, to improve their interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the section on 'implementation' describes some of the challenges of implementing reporting guidelines. Reference is made on line 255 to 'theoretically-derived interventions which have demonstrated effectiveness in the development of implementation interventions'. You then go on to state that a list of proposed stakeholders have been identified. I am assuming – though it isn’t clearly linked – that this is one of the evidence based interventions you are using to address implementation challenges.</td>
<td>There is no intended link between the two sections. As stated, a formal evidence-based implementation strategy is being developed as part of Larissa Shamseer’s PhD thesis project, however that research is not yet underway. The table is not evidence-based, it is a preliminary consideration of stakeholders, based on expert knowledge of the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder if this section which lists the challenges should precede the section beginning on line 195 which describes the post-publication activities. This would seem to give a more coherent flow to the paper, i.e. the challenges to dissemination, the use of evidence based approaches to dissemination and what these will be for the PRISMA-P.</td>
<td>We have ordered the manuscript according to the EQUATOR Network-recommended steps of guideline development. At this time, we wish to maintain the order of content as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A further consideration is to the wide range of types of reviews now published, for example the publication of rapid</td>
<td>Thank you for this observation. We have added text that is in line with what we have written in the Elaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reviews and reviews using more qualitative methodologies or reviewing qualitative primary studies. Is there scope for flexibility in the checklist, or should all types of systematic reviews be able to use this checklist? It would be helpful if some reference is made to the variety of methods used in systematic reviews and if the tool transfers to protocols for different 'types' of systematic review.

document. “There are many review types that are outside of this scope. As such, given the general lack of protocol guidance for other types of reviews, we encourage reviewers preparing any type of review protocol to make use of PRISMA-P as applicable.”