Author’s response to reviews

Title: Training to reduce LGBTQ-related bias among medical, nursing, and dental students: A systematic review

Authors:

Matthew Morris (mcmorris04@gmail.com)
Robert Cooper (rcooper@mmc.edu)
Aramandla Ramesh (aramesh@mmc.edu)
Mohammed Tabatabai (mtabatabai@mmc.edu)
Thomas Arcury (tarcury@wakehealth.edu)
Marybeth Shinn (beth.shinn@vanderbilt.edu)
Wansoo Im (wim@mmc.edu)
Paul Juarez (pjuarez@mmc.edu)
Patricia Matthews-Juarez (pmatthews-juarez@mmc.edu)

Version: 3 Date: 19 Jun 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

June 19, 2019

Liam Messin, PhD
Editor, BMC Series

Manuscript MEED-D-18-00443R2

Dear Dr. Messin,

We appreciate your consideration of this second resubmission of Manuscript MEED-D-18-00443R2, titled “Training to reduce LGBTQ-related bias among medical, nursing, and dental students: A systematic review.” We thank the reviewer for raising some lingering concerns. In response to these comments, we have made the following revisions to the manuscript and highlight additions/revisions to the manuscript.
Editor:

1. “We have noted that author Wansoo Im (WI) is missing in the listed authors' contributions. The individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript should be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section.”

We now specify co-author WI’s contributions to the conception and design of the systematic review (p. 20). WI is also included in references to “all authors” being involved with drafting and revising the manuscript as well as reading and approving the final version.

2. “Please remove the PRISMA from the file inventory as it is no longer needed at this stage of the editorial process.”

We have removed this file.

3. “At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Additional files should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.”

We have uploaded a clean version of the manuscript that includes changes requested by the editor and reviewer.

Reviewer 3:

1. “There are some minor typos and errors in the manuscript which need to be addressed including some results reported in the methods section…”

We have gone through the manuscript to address minor typos and errors. We have moved details of the study selection results from the Methods section to the Results section (pp. 10-11).

2. “…and a limited reporting of the reasons for exclusion at full text.”

We report that 47 out of 60 studies selected for full-text review were excluded. These exclusions were all based on the following criterion: absence of an intervention or training program. Given that this criterion was the primary reason for all of these exclusions, we could not provide any additional details on reasons for exclusion.

In summary, we have addressed each of the editor’s and 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.