

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	The efficacy and safety of different anticoagulants on patients with severe sepsis and derangement of coagulation: a protocol for network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Jiang, Libing; Jiang, Shouyin; Feng, Xia; Ma, Yuefeng; Zhang, Mao

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Brian Casserly University hospital limerick limerick Irleand
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	03-Nov-2014

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	excellent concept for paper that is well presented and well thought out 3 corrections page 8 line 44 Important should not be capitalised page 9 line 23 change fund to found page 10 line 21 change make to made
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Francesco Dentali Department of Clinical Medicine, Insubria University, Italy
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	13-Nov-2014

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	It is an interesting protocol adressing a very important question. I have only two minor commments. 1. Since anticoagulants (e.g. LMWH) may be used in septic patients also to reduce venous thromboembolic complications and VTE-related death, the aim of the study should be better specified in the title. 2. I do not understand the definition of subgroup analyses according to the number of studies available (I suggest to plan the subgroup analysis before performing the systematic review).
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer number: 1

Comment: “excellent concept for paper that is well presented and well thought out

3 corrections

page 8 line 44 Important should not be capitalised

page 9 line 23 change fund to found

page 10 line 21 change make to made”

Response: We are grateful for the positive comments regarding our paper. And we have revised our manuscript according to what you say. Once again, many thanks for your kind comments.

Reviewer number: 2

It is an interesting protocol addressing a very important question.

Response: We are grateful for the positive comments regarding our paper.

Comment 1: "Since anticoagulants (e.g. LMWH) may be used in septic patients also to reduce venous thromboembolic complications and VTE-related death, the aim of the study should be better specified in the title."

Response: Thank you for your positive comments and insightful suggestions. We have changed the title of our paper to "The efficacy and safety of different anticoagulants on patients with severe sepsis and derangement of coagulation: a protocol for network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials" in our revised manuscript. We are looking forward to your further suggestions and comments.

Comment 2: "I do not understand the definition of subgroup analyses according to the number of studies available (I suggest to plan the subgroup analysis before performing the systematic review)."

Response: Thank you for your critical comments. And we have revised the expression in our revised manuscript. Once again, many thanks for your critical suggestion.

We tried our best to improve this manuscript by making substantial corrections. We really hoped that these can satisfy the academic editor and reviewers. Finally we greatly appreciate for the editor and reviewers' warm work for our paper, and once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.