

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Prognostic prediction models for treatment experienced people living with HIV: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis
AUTHORS	Wu, Xinsheng; Chen, Yuanyi; Lu, Zhen; wang, junfeng; Zou, Huachun

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Gary Kaplan</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Thomas Jefferson University, Scott Memorial Library
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	none
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	20-Jan-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors present a protocol for a systematic review and meta analysis of prognostic prediction models for treatment-experienced people living with HIV.</p> <p>For the PubMed search, include the Medical Subject Heading for AIDS: "Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome"[Mesh].</p> <p>The Scopus search strategy contains single quotes were double quotes are required, e.g., TITLE-ABS-KEY('human immunodeficiency virus') instead of TITLE-ABS-KEY("human immunodeficiency virus").</p> <p>For all databases, consider adding additional prognostic model terms such as "disease progression score", "risk index" and "multivariate models" to find PMIDs 23095314, 11125890, 7535828 which are missed by the current PubMed strategy, but cited as known studies of prognostic models, references 19, 20, 26.</p> <p>(Note, I did not review the EMBASE strategy as I don't have access to the database.)</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Mark Youssef</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	University of Ottawa Faculty of Medicine
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	None
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	08-Jun-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a well written, clear and concise protocol of a planned systematic review and meta analysis that will answer a clinically relevant question. The authors adhere to PRISMA-P and other relevant guidelines. They have identified clear inclusion criteria that are relevant to study outcomes. They have outlined clear and appropriate statistics and assessment of risk of bias.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>Comments and questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They have outlined a comprehensive search strategy that includes hand searching, however they have not identified that they will search conferences or grey literature. This should to be included to strengthen the review and limit bias. 2. Why were only these three databases included and not others, more relevant databases should to be included to be create a more comprehensive search.
--	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Comments to the Author:

The authors present a protocol for a systematic review and meta analysis of prognostic prediction models for treatment-experienced people living with HIV.

For the PubMed search, include the Medical Subject Heading for AIDS: "Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome"[Mesh].

Authors' reply:

Thank you for your kind suggestion. We have included "Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome"[Mesh] in the PubMed search strategy in our revised Supplementary Appendix.

The Scopus search strategy contains single quotes were double quotes are required, e.g., TITLE-ABS-KEY('human immunodeficiency virus') instead of TITLE-ABS-KEY("human immunodeficiency virus").

Authors' reply:

Thank you for this reminder. We have revised the double quotes to single quotes in our revised Supplementary Appendix.

For all databases, consider adding additional prognostic model terms such as "disease progression score", "risk index" and "multivariate models" to find PMIDs 23095314, 11125890, 7535828 which are missed by the current PubMed strategy, but cited as known studies of prognostic models, references 19, 20, 26.

Authors' reply:

Thank you for your constructive suggestion. To maintain the relevance and accuracy of the search results, we decided to use more specific search terms: 'multivariate models for predicting progression', 'risk index for mortality' and 'disease progression score'. We have added these three terms to our updated search strategy in the revised manuscript and Supplementary Appendix. We have tested the new search terms mentioned above and found that this leads to the inclusion of additional studies.

(Note, I did not review the EMBASE strategy as I don't have access to the database.)

Reviewer #2:

Comments to the Author:

This is a well written, clear and concise protocol of a planned systematic review and meta analysis that will answer a clinically relevant question. The authors adhere to PRISMA-P and other relevant guidelines. They have identified clear inclusion criteria that are relevant to study outcomes. They have outlined clear and appropriate statistics and assessment of risk of bias.

Comments and questions:

1. They have outlined a comprehensive search strategy that includes hand searching, however they have not identified that they will search conferences or grey literature. This should to be included to strengthen the review and limit bias.

Authors' reply:

Thank you for your suggestion. We have added OpenGrey (www.opengrey.eu/), a database containing conference abstracts that has not been published, to the database that we will search in.

2. Why were only these three databases included and not others, more relevant databases should to be included to be create a more comprehensive search.

Authors' reply:

Thank you for this kind suggestion. We have added the Cochrane Library and OpenGrey to the database that we will search in so that we can create a more comprehensive search.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER NAME	<i>Gary Kaplan</i>
REVIEWER AFFILIATION	Thomas Jefferson University, Scott Memorial Library
REVIEWER CONFLICT OF INTEREST	none
DATE REVIEW RETURNED	30-Jun-2024

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>"A comprehensive and systematic literature search will be conducted in two major publicly available electronic medical literature databases..."</p> <p>Update to from two to four databases.</p> <p>The Scopus search strategy still has error-causing single quotes. Change them to double quotes.</p>
------------------	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1:

Comments to the Author:

"A comprehensive and systematic literature search will be conducted in two major publicly available electronic medical literature databases..."

Update to from two to four databases.

Authors' reply:

Thank you for pointing out this error. Based on the number of literature databases we included, we have updated it from two to five databases in the revised manuscript.

The Scopus search strategy still has error-causing single quotes. Change them to double quotes.

Authors' reply:

Thank you for this reminder. In your initial feedback, the example provided (TITLE-ABS-KEY('human immunodeficiency virus')) suggested using single quotes, which led me to use single quotes. Now, we have revised the single quotes to double quotes in our revised Supplementary Appendix to ensure accuracy.