Author’s response to reviews

Title: The role of icodextrin in peritoneal dialysis: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors:

Monika Becker (monika.becker@uni-wh.de)
Stefanie Bühn (stefanie.buehn@uni-wh.de)
Jessica Breuing (jessica.breuing@uni-wh.de)
Catherine A Firane (Catherine.firanek@outlook.com)
Simone Hess (simone.hess@uni-wh.de)
Hisanori Nariai (Hisanori_Nariai@baxter.com)
Mark R Marshall (markrogermarshall@icloud.com)
James A Sloand (james_sloand@baxter.com)
Qiang Yao (qiang_yao@baxter.com)
Käthe Goossen (kaethe.goossen@uni-wh.de)
Dawid Pieper (dawid.pieper@uni-wh.de)

Version: 1 Date: 27 Dec 2018

Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1:

I think this topic is important in Nephrology field. I strongly suggest the revision/modification of published protocol as below for transparency:

1. Timeline for searching needs to be specified in the protocol according to the timeline that the investigators used in PROSPERO registration in both abstract and fulltext.

Response of the authors: We understand your comment to be targeted at possible limitations regarding the publication date. This is described in the abstract under Methods, and in the main text under Information sources as follows: “We will not apply any limitations regarding
language, publication status and publication date when searching for eligible studies.” This corresponds to the information provided in the PROSPERO registration. In case further specification is necessary, we would appreciate additional details of what is requested.

2. Two independent reviewers need to be specified in the protocol; who are the two reviewers by using the initial.

Response of the authors: We have added the initials of the reviewers to all relevant parts of the Methods section.

3. Who is "a third person”? need to be specify.

Response of the authors: The third person is a reviewer involved in the project and co-author of this protocol. We added his initials and wrote “reviewer” instead of “person”.

4. It is recommended that Kappa coefficient should also be calculated to determine the agreement between the investigators of two reviewers.

Response of the authors: To our knowledge, the calculation of the Kappa coefficient is no standard procedure within the development of a systematic review. Furthermore, the result of inter-rater agreement is difficult to interpret. As an example, for study selection, there might a high kappa coefficient but the reviewers have excluded relevant studies, while it might be small even though no relevant studies were missed. Given that, this calculation has no implications for subsequent procedures.

5. Data management should be more specified? How would the investigators deal with duplication from each database? Manually vs software e.g. Endnote or Mendeley to check for duplicate publications.

Response of the authors: We have added the sentence “Duplicates will be removed manually”.

6. Can RevMan 5 software provide data on Egger’s test? Please elucidate me.

Response of the authors: No, RevMan 5 software does not provide data on Egger’s test. We will use the tool “Meta-Essentials” (Suurmond R, van Rhee, H, Hak T. (2017). Introduction, comparison and validation of Meta-Essentials: A free and simple tool for meta-analysis.
We added this reference in the protocol and complemented the sentence: “…publication bias using funnel plots (using RevMan 5 software) and Egger’s test (using Meta-Essentials).”

There are misspelled/misused words as below:

1. “Adults and children with end-stage kidney disease who receiving any type of PD”; “who receiving any type of PD” is not correct in grammar.
Response of the authors: Thank you, we have corrected that.

2. "insulin resistence in non-diabetic patients"; "resistence" should be "resistance"
Response of the authors: Thank you, we have corrected that.

3. "each language" should be re-written to represent better meaning of no restrictions in language.
Response of the authors: We rewrote it: “We will include published or unpublished studies irrespective of their language…”

Reviewer #2:

Thank you to all the authors for the opportunity to review this interesting protocol.

1. 156 - One of the systematic reviews you cite, Cho, Y et al from 2014 was recently updated in October 2018. How does this impact your protocol? I suggest you mention the review was recently updated; if it doesn't impact the rationale behind your protocol, it can only strengthen the case for your review; if it does, you must address it.
Response of the authors: Thank you for taking the time to review this protocol! We have added the reference of the updated review and a sentence in the introduction: “Although the Cochrane review was recently updated [12], the rationale for our review remains unchanged”. Furthermore, we delete the sentence “Furthermore, several new potentially relevant studies were published since 2014” (discussion) as the updated Review has found these references.
2. The authors have indicated they have prepared the protocol using PRISMA-P, but they haven't mentioned the methods in which they will conduct the study, or the reporting guideline (PRISMA) they'll use to report the review. Are you using the Cochrane Handbook? York CRD's? I suggest the authors indicate this in their protocol.

Response of the authors: We added a sentence under PRESENTING AND REPORTING THE RESULTS: “The reporting in the systematic review will adhere to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)”.

3. Great job in identifying a comprehensive list of sources. I suggest the authors document all searches, with the date, interface, and exact search terms entered, especially given you will search via interfaces that can be unstable at times. CADTH's Grey Matters Tool can be of help to guide the structure on how searches, particularly for some of these sources should be documented; definitely their grey literature sources. https://www.cadth.ca/resources/finding-evidence/grey-matters

Response of the authors: Thank you very much for that comment! We often rely or follow CADTH tools for librarians. Therefore, all of our searches will be documented in a way that will ensure reproducibility. We have added the following sentence to the data management section: “The search interfaces, dates, terms, and results will be documented for each database”.

4. Are you double checking results to ascertain that these publication types (commentaries, letters, editorials) are the only ones being excluded from the search?

Response of the authors: We have problems understanding this comment. The comment refers to a search string in the search strategy: (“Comment” [Publication Type] OR "Letter" [Publication Type] OR "Editorial" [Publication Type]). This is part of a developed and validated search filter for RCTs we are going to apply. Thus, there is no need for any form of additional checking.

5. A data management plan should oversee all the information gathered, analysed, and presented in this study. I suggest the authors consider having a data management plan (DMP). Guidance can be sought out from their in-house resources through their institutions, or via freely available structures such as: https://dmptool.org/

Response of the authors: For this systematic review, we plan to use established in-house procedures for data management, including the documentation of searches, search results, sources of extracted data, as well as quality control of included data. The DMP tool is certainly one we will evaluate in the future.