

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. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Herbal medicines for cancer cachexia : Protocol for a systematic review
AUTHORS	Park, Bongki; Jun, Ji Hee; Jung, Jeeyoun; You, Sooseong; Lee, Myeong Soo

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Taixiang Wu West China Hospital, Sichuan University
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Mar-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This will be an valuable research, but the job will be a challenge.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The writing style is whole Cochrane style exactly, I would suggest authors change something;2. The Search in WHO ICTRP is for ongoing studies, should be stated; and the clinicaltrial.gov, clinical controlled trial (ISRCTN) and others are included in WHO ICTRP, no need to describe them separately;3. Statistics method: if the event rate lower than 1%, Peto OR with 95%CI will be used, lower than 20%, OR with 95%CI and more than 20%, RR will be used.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Akio Inui Kagoshima University Japan
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Apr-2014

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors described a protocol for systematic review on herbal medicine for cancer cachexia. The theme is timely and important for research and clinical practice. The authors need to include an expert on traditional Japanese herbal medicine that also developed on its own several hundred years ago. This is important since as far as I know only Japanese herbal medicine is evaluated by 3D HPLC analysis to minimize the variability at the contents between the lots. Therefore most of the herbal medicines do not guarantee the same clinical effects when patients take different lots.</p> <p>The authors need to include survival advantage in the secondary outcomes. Appendix 2 should include Japanese Kanji characters.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1 : Taixiang Wu

Institution and Country West China Hospital, Sichuan University

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None known

This will be an valuable research, but the job will be a challenge.

1. The writing style is whole Cochrane style exactly, I would suggest authors change something; The Search in WHO ICTRP is for ongoing studies, should be stated; and the clinicaltrials.gov, clinical controlled trial (ISRCTN) and others are included in WHO ICTRP, no need to describe them separately;

Revised> As the reviewer said, we have deleted the paragraph 'the metaRegister of Controlled Trials (mRCT) (www.controlled-trials.com/mrct), clinicaltrials.gov (www.Clinicaltrials.gov)'. (page 9th, paragraph 2nd, lines 3-4)

2. Statistics method: if the event rate lower than 1%, Peto OR with 95%CI will be used, lower than 20%, OR with 95%CI and more than 20%, RR will be used.

Revised> We have rewritten the 'Measurement of the treatment effect'. (page 10, 3rd paragraph, lines 2-4)

Reviewer #2: Akio Inui

1. The authors described a protocol for systematic review on herbal medicine for cancer cachexia. The theme is timely and important for research and clinical practice. The authors need to include an expert on traditional Japanese herbal medicine that also developed on its own several hundred years ago. This is important since as far as I know only Japanese herbal medicine is evaluated by 3D HPLC analysis to minimize the variability at the contents between the lots. Therefore most of the herbal medicines do not guarantee the same clinical effects when patients take different lots.

Answer> Thank you for your comment about the traditional Japanese medicine. Traditional Korean medicine, traditional Japanese medicine and traditional Chinese medicine have a lot of thing in common. And the curriculum of traditional Korean medicine did not separate traditional Korean medicine and traditional Japanese & Chinese medicine. So, we think that the doctors of Korean medicine could comprehend the traditional Japanese medicine and analyze the data of traditional Japanese medicine articles.

2. The authors need to include survival advantage in the secondary outcomes.

Revised> We have added a new outcome in the 'Type of outcome measures' section. (page 8th, paragraph 2nd, line 11)

3. Appendix 2 should include Japanese Kanji characters.

Revised> We have added the Kanji characters for cachexia in the Appendix 2. (page 20th, paragraph 2nd, line 3)

Thank you for your valuable comments.