

1-Nov-2019

BMJ-2019-051174.R1

Industry funding of patient and health consumer organisations: Systematic review with meta-analysis

Dear Dr. Fabbri,

Thank you for sending us your revised paper. I sincerely apologise for the delay in reaching a decision. I was waiting for the statistician's report, which came in just a few days ago. He is pleased with the revision but has a few remaining comments that I would like you to address. I do not think this will take long.

When you return your revised manuscript, please note that The BMJ requires an ORCID ID for corresponding authors of all research articles. If you do not have an ORCID ID, registration is free and takes a matter of seconds.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Elizabeth Loder

To start your revision, please click this link or log in to your account: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj?URL_MASK=e2d1f943d2914552bd89603b841f976b

****Report from The BMJ's manuscript committee meeting****

These comments are an attempt to summarise the discussions at the manuscript meeting. They are not an exact transcript.

Members of the committee were: xxx (chair), yyy (statistician), [and list other eds who took part]

Decision: Put points

Detailed comments from the meeting:

First, please revise your paper to respond to all of the comments by the reviewers. Their reports are available at the end of this letter, below.

Please also respond to these additional comments by the committee:

*
*
*
*

In your response please provide, point by point, your replies to the comments made by the reviewers and the editors, explaining how you have dealt with them in the paper.

**** Comments from the external peer reviewers****

Reviewer: 1

Comments:

Generally this looks fine but some minor adjustments in the reporting are necessary.

Figure 3 and 5 in main body provide a line that appears to be equivalent to the potential pooled estimate. Please remove as well as the weights provided in these Figures as there is no pooled estimate produced given the high levels of heterogeneity.

Also, for Figure 3, although there is a note: " *Data received from the authors", I could not find any study to link that note to.

In the Supplementary material: Suggest you remove Figures 1 and 8 as all information is already provided in the subgroup analyses in Figures 2 to 5 and Figure 9, and you do not want to emphasise the pooled estimate as the heterogeneity is high.

Also, the use of funnel plots (Figures 6 and 7) is questionable for summaries of prevalence (even using Peters' method). If decide to keep, please provide reasoning behind their use and if possible a reference for their adequate use when summarising prevalence data. Some minor adjustment in main text might be required if funnel plots are removed but this should not affect main results and discussion.

Additional Questions:

The BMJ uses compulsory open peer review. Your name and institution will be included with your comments when they are sent to the authors. If the manuscript is accepted, your review, name and institution will be published alongside the article.

If this manuscript is rejected from The BMJ, it may be transferred to another BMJ journal along with your reviewer comments. If the article is selected for publication in another BMJ journal, depending on the editorial policy of the journal your review may also be published. You will be contacted for your permission before this happens.

For more information, please see our peer review terms and conditions.

Please confirm that you understand and consent to the above terms and conditions.: I consent to the publication of this review

Please enter your name: Rafael Perera

Job Title: Professor of Medical Statistics

Institution: University of Oxford

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: No

Funds for a member of staff?: No

Fees for consulting?: No

Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests (please see BMJ policy) please declare them here: none