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June 10, 2019

Liam Messin, PhD
Editor, BMC Series

Manuscript MEED-D-18-00443R1

Dear Dr. Messin,

We appreciate your consideration of this second resubmission of Manuscript MEED-D-18-00443R1, now titled “Training to reduce LGBTQ-related bias among medical, nursing, and dental students: A systematic review.” We thank the reviewer for raising important issues and for their helpful suggestions. In response to these comments, we have made the following revisions to the manuscript and highlight additions/revisions to the manuscript.
Reviewer #3:

1. “There is very limited evidence that a systematic protocol was followed. This may be purely that the information has not been reported, rather than not followed and this needs to be addressed. Methodologically this paper does not adhere to the PRISMA guidelines that it claims to have used, which are required for systematic reviews. There are so many gaps in what is required for a systematic review and what is reported in this paper that the authors must revisit the PRISMA checklists and apply them to update their reporting. This need to start with the title of the review, which does not match their intent outlined which was for medicine nursing and dentistry? A justification for this population is needed alongside each element of their PICO question.”

We now provide greater detail throughout the manuscript regarding adherence to PRISMA guidelines and include the PRISMA checklist with resubmission materials. We have changed the title of the review to clarify that this review included programs targeting medical, nursing, and dental students. We also include a detailed justification for our research question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) in the introduction (p. 8).

2. “The abstract can be aligned with PRISMA for abstracts and then a review of the PRISMA checklist will highlight the areas that this manuscript has not reported.”

We now provide greater detail on PRISMA guidelines in the abstract.

3. “Some examples of missing information include methodology of the searches themselves, data extraction, analysis, risk of bias.”

We now include sections in the Methods addressing eligibility criteria (p. 9), search methodology and data extraction (pp. 9-10), and study quality and risk of bias (p. 10). We include page numbers for all PRISMA elements in the attached PRISMA checklist.

4. “The PRISMA flow chart as currently reported in Figure 1 is not adequately detailed and needs more information regarding the reasons for exclusion, further it is standard practice to provide an example of the actual search strategy conducted for one database (e.g. Medline).”

We now include greater detail in Figure 2 regarding reasons for exclusion and also provide an example search strategy for MEDLINE/PubMed (Figure 1).

In summary, we have addressed each of the reviewer’s concerns and have modified the manuscript accordingly. These changes have improved the overall clarity, quality, and impact of the paper. We look forward to receiving your decision regarding the revised manuscript. Thank you very much for your consideration.