PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (**http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf**) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Factors associated with caregiver burden among family caregivers of children with cerebral palsy: A systematic review
AUTHORS	Liu, Fang; Shen, Qiao; Huang, Miao; Zhou, Hengyu

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Atar , Emel University of Health Sciences
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Jul-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	I applaud the authors for their efforts.

REVIEWER	Sakzewski, Leanne The University of Queensland, Queensland Cerebral Palsy and Rehabilitation Research Centre
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jan-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	This paper reported on the results of a systematic review exploring factors associated with caregiver burden for caregivers of children with CP. I have two major concerns about this paper. 1. The search was completed in August 2021 so is already 17 months old and would need to be redone. 2. The use of the GRADE approach in this case seems unusual and there is little detail as to how authors derived their ratings. Given these are all non-randomised trials, they are automatically downgraded to Low and then there are only three instances where the rating might be upgraded, none of which are likely. It is unclear how authors came to the conclusion regarding strong and moderate certainty evidence. The title of table 4 indicates that this is an adapted version of GRADE which has not been explained sufficiently, and adaptation is not recommended by GRADE. Minor Comments Page 3 lines 5-7. This reference is outdated (see systematic review by McIntyre 2022) in DMCN which demonstrates the rates of CP are declining in high income countries. The JBI Critical appraisal checklist was used to rate the quality of included studies, but there is no detail as to how to interpret the results of this checklist which would be helpful for readers. Results: A synthesised summary of results would be of interest, for example the ranges of correlations between factors across studies, which would give the reader some understanding of the magnitude of association between caregiver burden and the various factors presented.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1: I applaud the authors for their efforts.
Response: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work.

Reviewer #2:
Q1. The search was completed in August 2021 so is already 17 months old and would need to be redone.
Response : We are grateful for the suggestion. As suggested by the reviewer, we have supplemented the literature retrieval from 2021/7/24 to 2023/2/1. As a result, there are some data changes in the master file and appendix, which are highlighted in green.

Q2. The use of the GRADE approach in this case seems unusual and there is little detail as to how authors derived their ratings. Given these are all non-randomised trials, they are automatically downgraded to Low and then there are only three instances where the rating might be upgraded, none of which are likely. It is unclear how authors came to the conclusion regarding strong and moderate certainty evidence. The title of table 4 indicates that this is an adapted version of GRADE which has not been explained sufficiently, and adaptation is not recommended by GRADE.
Response : We apologize for the inaccurate information in the original manuscript. We have added the criteria for GRADE upgrade and downgrade on page 4 of the manuscript. In accordance with this criterion and the GRADE 5 factor evaluation criteria in Appendix 4, we re-rated each potential factor and corrected the information in the manuscript. Finally, we determined depression of caregiver and severity of illness in children with CP were moderate quality of evidence for factors due to the "large effect". For the title of table 4, here is the meaning of self-made table by adding other information such as participants, while the five factors of the GRADE were not adapted. To avoid ambiguity, I changed the title of Table 4 to "Quality of evidence for potential factors".

Q3. Page 3 lines 5-7. This reference is outdated (see systematic review by McIntyre 2022) in DMCN which demonstrates the rates of CP are declining in high income countries.
Response : We apologize for the inaccurate information in the original manuscript. We have corrected that sentence on page 3 and updated the literature on page 16.

Q4. The JBI Critical appraisal checklist was used to rate the quality of included studies, but there is no detail as to how to interpret the results of this checklist which would be helpful for readers.
Response : We are grateful for the suggestion. To be more clearly, we have added a "EXPLANATION OF ANALYTICAL CROSS SECTIONAL STUDIES CRITICAL APPRAISAL" in Appendix 3.

Q5. Results: A synthesised summary of results would be of interest, for example the ranges of correlations between factors across studies, which would give the reader some understanding of the magnitude of association between caregiver burden and the various factors presented.
Response : I'm sorry I didn't catch what you meant, but I guess you probably meant to add detailed descriptions of factors from different studies into the results. I think I've done that on page 7 of the main file.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes marked in green in revised paper which will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.