

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)	The Necessity Of Dural Tenting Sutures In Modern Neurosurgery: Protocol For A Systematic Review
AUTHORS	Przepiórka, Łukasz; Kunert, Przemysław; Żyłkowski, Jarosław; Fortuniak, Jan; Larysz, Patrycja; Szczepanek, Dariusz; Wiśniewski, Karol; Jaskólski, Dariusz; Ładziński, Piotr; Rola, Radosław; Trojanowski, Tomasz; Marchel, Andrzej

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Norberto Andaluz Institution and Country: University of Louisville, USA Competing interests: NONE
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Nov-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	This proposed protocol is well designed and written. The outcome measures are properly selected, and the proposed methodology of research seems posed to resolve the research question. Will be looking forward to hearing about the author's findings.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Reviewer name: Damiano Giuseppe Barone Institution and Country: University of Cambridge, UK Competing interests: None declared
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Dec-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dr Przepiórka and colleagues presented the protocol for a systematic review on the role of dural tenting in modern neurosurgery. The review will be of interest to all neurosurgeons engaged in cranial practice. The authors provide a clear background and research question. Additionally, the study design is appropriate for the scope of the project.</p> <p>There are a few sentences in the introduction that need rephrasing for clarity (page 4 – line 71-74, 77-79, 82-84).</p> <p>The search strategy needs to be changed to include terms in both British and American English spelling (e.g. haematoma and hematoma) to maximise the change to include all relevant literature. Please consider include 'extradural' as it is also used interchangeably to 'epidural' in the context of haematomas.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Norberto Andaluz

Institution and Country: University of Louisville, USA

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

- This proposed protocol is well designed and written. The outcome measures are properly selected, and the proposed methodology of research seems posed to resolve the research question. Will be looking forward to hearing about the author's findings.

Response: Thank you for your kind review.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Damiano Giuseppe Barone

Institution and Country: University of Cambridge, UK

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

Dr Przepiórka and colleagues presented the protocol for a systematic review on the role of dural tenting in modern neurosurgery. The review will be of interest to all neurosurgeons engaged in cranial practice. The authors provide a clear background and research question. Additionally, the study design is appropriate for the scope of the project.

Response: Thank you for your kind review.

- There are a few sentences in the introduction that need rephrasing for clarity (page 4 – line 71-74, 77-79, 82-84).

Response: This has been fixed. Please see the sentences in lines 73-74, 79-80 and 84-85 respectively if their meaning is clear enough now.

- The search strategy needs to be changed to include terms in both British and American English spelling (e.g. haematoma and hematoma) to maximise the change to include all relevant literature. Please consider include 'extradural' as it is also used interchangeably to 'epidural' in the context of haematomas.

Response: This has been fixed in Table 2, on page 10. Table 3, however, does not require additional search phrases as it already uses Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) phrases, which cover different spellings and synonyms.

FORMATTING AMENDMENTS (if any)

Required amendments will be listed here; please include these changes in your revised version:

- Patient and Public Involvement:

Authors must include a statement in the METHODS section of the manuscript under the sub-heading 'Patient and Public Involvement'.

This should provide a brief response to the following questions:

- How was the development of the research question and outcome measures informed by patients' priorities, experience, and preferences?
- How did you involve patients in the design of this study?
- Were patients involved in the recruitment to and conduct of the study?

- How will the results be disseminated to study participants?
- For randomised controlled trials, was the burden of the intervention assessed by patients themselves?
- Patient advisers should also be thanked in the contributorship statement/acknowledgements.
- If patients and or public were not involved please state this.

Response: This has been fixed – there was no patient nor public involvement. Appropriate sub-heading and sentence were added in lines 184-185 on page 8.