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Author’s response to reviews:

Point-By-Point Response

Psychotropic medication non-adherence and associated factors among adult patients with major psychiatric disorders: a protocol for systematic review

Agumasie Semahegn; Kwasi Torpey; Abubakar Manu; Nega Assefa; Gezahegn Tesfaye; Augustine Ankomah: Systematic Reviews (SYSR-D-17-00186R2)

Reviewer reports:

Dear Mr. Semahegn,

Your manuscript "Psychotropic medication non-adherence and associated factors among adult patients with major psychiatric disorders: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis" (SYSR-D-17-00186R2) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication
in Systematic Reviews, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers.

We thank you so much for the kind response and wonderful progress of our manuscript.

Reviewer #1: I have no more comments.

Response: we really thank for the rigorous scientific review so far and your contribution was so helpful for the betterment of our manuscript. We thank you so much!

Reviewer #2: This systematic review protocol is now very much improved from the previous two versions. Most of the issues I have raised are now addressed. There is one more point I strongly insist the authors to work on. The quality assessment tool is not appropriate. The authors mentioned they will use STROBE to assess the quality of the studies. STROBE is not a quality assessment tool. It is a reporting checklist for observational studies. STROBE is a PRISMA equivalent for observational studies. The authors have to choose a suitable tool. Let me suggest some appropriate quality assessment tools. You may choose one of them

1. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (cited nearly 8500 times)
   http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp

2. For cross-sectional/survey studies: the NIH Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies:

3. You can also use the Risk of Bias in non-Randomized studies of interventions (ROBINS-I) tool to assess Risk of Bias in any non-RCT
   http://methods.cochrane.org/bias/risk-bias-non-randomized-studies-interventions
Using tools such as Covidence (endorsed by Cochrane) can help systematic review authors automate the systematic review process. Try to visit the Sys Rev tool box for more helpful softwares.

Response: we thank you for the comment, and we will use The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale to assess the quality of studies.

Associate Editor Comments; please kindly consider the following comments;

1) Title, "Psychotropic ...Psychiatric Disorders: a Protocol for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis"

please revise the title as suggested in PRISMA-P

e.g. "Psychotropic ...Psychiatric Disorders: a protocol of a systematic review"

Response: we thank you and addressed the comment as per the recommendation.

2) Data Source and Searching Strategies, would it be better to revise this heading to "Search methods for identification of studies", then provide the following info. ;

a) Electronic searches (search strategies of each database in appendix; option)

b) Searching other resources (e.g. reference lists, handsearched conference proceedings)

Response: We thank you and addressed the comment as per the recommendation.

3) Please add info. on how to manage all search results, how would you identify duplicates, any software (e.g. EndNote, Zotero)
Response: We thank you and addressed the comment as per the recommendation. Overall searched and identified studies will be exported to EndNote citation manager and duplicates will be excluded (Reference find duplicates excluded duplicates).

4) Quality Assurance of the Systematic review, i think info. under this heading are redundant, should be removed.

in addition, the authors planned to apply STROBE for quality assessment of included studies. I totally disagreed for this tool as

STROBE is a guideline for reporting observational studies, not a tool to assess risk of bias.

The tool must be revised to the appropriate one e.g. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS)

Response: we thank you and addressed the comment as per the recommendation. We will use the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for studies quality assessment.

5) Data Extraction, please provide data extraction form in additional file.

and please consider if an included study presents adjusted effect-measure (e.g. adjusted OR), what info. should be extracted.

Response: we thank you for the comment. We prepared the data extraction tablet as per the recommendation in additional file form.

6) Data synthesis,

- how would you incorporate quality assessment into interpreting the finding?

Response: thank you for the comment. Once studies will be selected based on the quality assessment tool and heterogeneity test. The heterogeneous studies will be narrated and synthesized. But relatively homogenous studies finding will be pooled, and meta-analysis will be carried out.
7) in case that the included studies reported different period of assessment (e.g. 1, month, 6 months, 2 years) how would you handle in analysis. please plan.

Response: we thank you for the comment. We will handle such type of reports through subgroup analysis. Addressed in the revised manuscript.

Thank you so much!