Reviewer’s report

Title: Probiotics for glycemic control in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: protocol for a systematic review

Version: 0 Date: 17 Apr 2019

Reviewer: Loai Albarqouni

Reviewer's report:

Thanks for inviting me to review this manuscript. In this protocol, authors aim to conduct a systematic review of randomised controlled trials that evaluated the effectiveness and safety of probiotics for glycaemic control in patients with T2DM. Overall, this is well written and devised protocol which adhered to the international standards of conducting systematic reviews (i.e. Cochrane).

Few issues might help improving this protocol.

Introduction

Page 5; lines 74-76: I would support these statements with evidence generated form systematic review and metanalysis.

Authors mentioned that there are few systematic reviews which have synthesised data relevant to this question. I would expect more details about these reviews and why a new review is needed (e.g. this review has been conducted few years ago https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26899960).

Methods

Type of participants - authors should justify their decision to include people with prediabetes as this may varied widely between trials.

Type of interventions - it would be great to briefly outline the differences between probiotics, prebiotics, and symbiotic.

Type of outcome measures - authors should explicitly articulate the short-term vs. long-term outcome measurements because the authors in the first sentences of this paragraph were talking
about the duration of treatment with probiotics, which might not correlate with the timing of the outcomes.

I wonder if the authors have any plans to ask primary study authors specifically for data regarding the adverse events (since this is not commonly reported in the publications).
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