

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)	Drugs targeting the JAK/STAT pathway for the treatment of immune-mediated inflammatory skin diseases: protocol for a scoping review
AUTHORS	Gomez-Garcia, Francisco; Gomez-Arias, Pedro Jesus; Hernandez, Jorge; Montilla, Ana Maria; Gay-Mimbrera, Jesús; Aguilar-Luque, Macarena; Viguera-Guerra, Isabel; Velez Garcia-Nieto, Antonio; Isla-Tejera, Beatriz; Ruano, Juan

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Cathryn Sibbald Children's Hospital of Philadelphia United States of America
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jan-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Overall well designed protocol, but would recommend a few edits as follows:</p> <p>Search strategy: Would strongly encourage adding CINAHL, Scopus or Web of Science to the search engines, especially since many relevant studies may be in more pre-clinical stages still and more likely to be captured by these databases. The dates searched for each database should also include the earliest publication date for each.</p> <p>The initial summary outlines that librarians were involved in the development of the search strategy, so this information should be included in the protocol itself.</p> <p>A list of databases to be searched for meeting abstracts and other grey literature sources should also be referenced or included, and this step should be included in the body of the protocol.</p> <p>A predefined time frame allowed for authors to get back to you (ex 4 or 6 weeks) should be included.</p> <p>For Study inclusion and Data collection, it is outlined that 2 researchers will do this, but it is not specified if they are performing duplicate screening and extraction or just dividing the work (and if in duplicate, is it 100% or a smaller percentage that will be done in duplicate). In addition, the process for resolving conflicts should be outlined.</p> <p>Finally, I would recommend including a list of preliminary search terms for the search strategy, especially in light of the broad nature of the intended search (for example, what terms will be used to limit diseases to dermatologic diseases?). As it stands, the protocol does not really allow for replication.</p>
-------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Limitations: would also include the limited ability to assess the quality of the included studies.</p> <p>Spelling/Grammatical corrections: The past and future tense are used throughout the protocol inconsistently. Please select one tense and ensure that all writing follows this tense.</p> <p>46 "we will use" instead of "we used" to maintain consistency in tenses 65 - "and scanning" - change to "and scan"? 94 - "JAK1 and JAK3" not "y" 115 "scoping" not "scope" 180 - Affiliation (not filiation)</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Alireza Firooz Center for Research and Training in Skin Diseases and Leprosy , Iran
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a protocol for a systematic review o use of JAK/Stat inhibitors in inflammatory skin diseases. A few narrative reviews have been published on this subject. The protocol itself does not add to available literature, and its publication depends on journal policy.</p> <p>The detailed search strategy, at least in 1 data bank, should be presented. Authors are recommended to review PRISMA again more carefully, specially items 8-12.</p>
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Cathryn Sibbald

Institution and Country: Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, United States of America

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Overall well designed protocol, but would recommend a few edits as follows:

Q1: Search strategy: Would strongly encourage adding CINAHL, Scopus or Web of Science to the search engines, especially since many relevant studies may be in more pre-clinical stages still and more likely to be captured by these databases. The dates searched for each database should also include the earliest publication date for each.

R1: As suggested the statement "Additionally, CINAHL, Scopus, and Web of Science to the search engines will be searched in this second step." ha been included in the subsection 'Identifying relevant literature' of the Method section in a new version of the manuscript (pg 9, ln 167-168).

Q2: The initial summary outlines that librarians were involved in the development of the search strategy, so this information should be included in the protocol itself.

R2: As suggested, "A systematic search developed by two health sciences librarians will perform using a three-step literature search." has been included in a new version of the protocol (pg 9, ln 162-163).

Q3: A list of databases to be searched for meeting abstracts and other grey literature sources should also be referenced or included, and this step should be included in the body of the protocol.

R2: As requested in Q1, we have now included SCOPUS and Web of Sciences databases that include various types of grey literature such as technical reports, dissertations, patents, meeting papers, annual reports or government publications, among others. We will search for grey literature on MEDLINE and Embase too, by restricting the "publication type" in our search.

Q4: A predefined time frame allowed for authors to get back to you (ex 4 or 6 weeks) should be included.

R4: We have established a time frame of 4 weeks after sending authors a mail requesting information about their study or publication (pg 9-10, lns 171-173).

Q5: For Study inclusion and Data collection, it is outlined that 2 researchers will do this, but it is not specified if they are performing duplicate screening and extraction or just dividing the work (and if in duplicate, is it 100% or a smaller percentage that will be done in duplicate). In addition, the process for resolving conflicts should be outlined.

R5: We have now clarified this issue throughout the manuscript. Thank you for pointing it out.

Q6: Finally, I would recommend including a list of preliminary search terms for the search strategy, especially in light of the broad nature of the intended search (for example, what terms will be used to limit diseases to dermatologic diseases?). As it stands, the protocol does not really allow for replication.

R6: A preliminary (first step) search strategy for MEDLINE (via Ovid) and Embase (via Ovid) has been included (Table 2) as an example.

Q7: Limitations: would also include the limited ability to assess the quality of the included studies.

R7: "Although we will try to analyse the quality of evidence per variable and disease using GRADE approach, probably most of the studies have produced documents communicating partial results following an observational design, which is associated with low or very low quality of evidence." This limitation has been included in the Conclusion section (pg 13, ln 237-240).

Q8: Spelling/Grammatical corrections: The past and future tense are used throughout the protocol inconsistently. Please select one tense and ensure that all writing follows this tense.

46 "we will use" instead of "we used" to maintain consistency in tenses

65 - "and scanning" - change to "and scan"?

94 - "JAK1 and JAK3" not "y"

115 "scoping" not "scope"

180 - Affiliation (not filiation)

R9: We have fixed all above mentioned issues. Thank you for figuring out.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Alireza Firooz

Institution and Country: Center for Research and Training in Skin Diseases and Leprosy , Iran

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

This is a protocol for a systematic review o use of JAK/Stat inhibitors in inflammatory skin diseases. A few narrative reviews have been published on this subject. The protocol itself does not add to available literature, and its publication depends on journal policy.

Q1: The detailed search strategy, at least in 1 data bank, should be presented.

R1: A preliminary (first step) search strategy for MEDLINE (via Ovid) and Embase (via Ovid) has been included (Table 2) as an example.

Q2: Authors are recommended to review PRISMA again more carefully, specially items 8-12.

R2: To clarify this, we have included a copy of the PRIMA for Protocols (PRISMA-P) checklist indicating the page/line numbers of our manuscript where the relevant information can be found.

Thank you for the suggestion.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Cathryn Sibbald Children's Hospital of Philadelphia
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	The revised version is improved, and I would recommend accepting it for publication
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Cathryn Sibbald

Institution and Country: Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Q1: The revised version is improved, and I would recommend accepting it for publication

R2: Thank you for your constructive comments that have helped us to greatly improve the manuscript.