Author’s response to reviews

Title: Assessment of the abstract reporting of systematic reviews of dose-response meta-analysis: A literature survey

Authors:

Pengli Jia (jiapenglili@163.com)
Bin Xu (xb1290043261@hotmail.com)
Jingmin Cheng (72-87@163.com)
Xi-Hao Huang (hxh397077820@hotmail.com)
Joey Kwong (jswkwong@hotmail.com)
Yu Liu (yuliu14@lzu.edu.cn)
Chao Zhang (zhangchao0803@126.com)
Ying Han (hanying0520@sxmu.edu.cn)
CHANG XU (xuchang2016@runbox.com)

Version: 2 Date: 01 Jul 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Edoardo Aromataris (Reviewer 1)

I have reviewed the revised manuscript. The authors have made changes according to reviewer's suggestions and the manuscript has improved a great deal. I still have one fundamental issue that I raised in the first round that I believe was misunderstood by the authors (my comment number 4) and does not appear to have been addressed. The authors have assessed 14 criteria to determine 'quality of abstract reporting in SR-DRMA's' (based on what is reported by Cochrane SRs). Of the 14 criteria, some are purely items of reporting, for example, '#2 rationale for the review' or '#11. Brief summary of evidence', others directly related to 'conduct' of the work. For example, to suggest 48.7% is 'poor reporting' with regards to '#8 risk of bias assessment', would seem to depend on 100% of the included SR-DRMAs actually having performed risk of bias assessment in the first place. If they haven't done it, reporting in the abstract is unwarranted and the conclusion would likely be the SR-DRMA may be at risk of bias, not that the abstract is deficient. The abstract is dependent on the work it is summarizing. I think to completely align with the objectives of the study as presented and the conclusions, 'conduct of SR-DRMA' according to Cochrane SR should also have been determined.
Response: We’d like to express our deep appreciate for your valuable and in-depth suggestions. We totally agree that the reporting of abstract is largely depends on the reporting of full-text and how the SR was conducted. We’ve discussed this point in the discussion part and highlighted the importance of the completeness of SR-DRMA itself and revised the conclusions in the abstract and full-text. We also added the comparison of abstract and full-text of the reporting based on the 14 items refers to modified PRISMA-abstract in the supplementary file (Figure S1).

Changes in conclusions:

“Given that reporting of abstract largely depends on the reporting and conduct of the SR-DRMA, review authors should also focus on the completeness of SR-DRMA itself.”