

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)	Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Risk of Asthma in Offspring: Protocol for A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
AUTHORS	Li, Ping; Xiong, tao; Hu, Yong

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Berihun Dachew Curtin University, School of Public Health
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. I appreciate the authors for their work and the research question is important. My main comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The authors need to indicate this work is a protocol not an original systematic review and meta-analysis, either in the title or introduction/aims section.• Does your review focuses on childhood asthma or will it include adult offspring too?• Please include anticipated potential limitations• Few grammar and punctuation errors: For instance, line 76-80 and 80-84.• The appendix missed quality assessment tool for cross-sectional studies and GRADE /Risk bias assessment tool.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Santa Cirmi University of Messina
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Nov-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The paper “Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Risk of Asthma in Offspring: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis” by Ping and co-workers described a systematic review protocol aimed to summarized the available evidence examining the association between hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and the risk of asthma in offspring.</p> <p>This study is interesting and will be the first systematic review and meta-analysis on this topic. However some points need to be improved before being publishable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The Authors must specify in the title that the paper is a protocol;2) The protocol need to be registered in Prospero;3) The Authors should included the dates of the study in the manuscript;4) The Authors should provide a flow chart of the study;5) Authors should to revise the English because some grammatical
-------------------------	--

	errors occur in the whole text.
REVIEWER	Michele Navarra University of Messina, Messina, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Jan-2020
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The paper “Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Risk of Asthma in Offspring: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis” by Ping et al., is a systematic review protocol to conduct it on hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and the risk of asthma in offspring.</p> <p>In my opinion, some points should be addressed in the paper before it being published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Authors should indicate in the title that the paper is a “protocol” and they should provide the PROSPERO registration number; - The Authors should provide a flow chart of the study. <p>In addition, a revision of English is strictly recommended.</p>

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Berihun Dachew

Institution and Country: Curtin University, School of Public Health

Please state any competing interests or state ‘None declared’: None declared

General comments

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you for the opportunity to review this systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. I appreciate the authors for their work and the research question is important. My main comments are as follows:

Question 1: The authors need to indicate this work is a protocol not an original systematic review and meta-analysis, either in the title or introduction/aims section.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have indicated that the article is a protocol in the title. Please see lines 1-2, page 1.

Question 2: Does your review focuses on childhood asthma or will it include adult offspring too?

Response: This systematic review will include all offspring (at any age) of HDP mothers. Both child offspring and adult offspring with asthma will be included. Please see lines 126-127, page 7.

Question 3: Please include anticipated potential limitations

Response: We appreciate your suggestion. Some potential limitations have been included in the “Strengths and limitations of this study” section of the paper. We added additional anticipated potential limitations in this section as well. Please see lines 58-69, pages 3-4.

Question 4: Few grammar and punctuation errors: For instance, line 76-80 and 80-84.

Response: We have revised the grammar and punctuation errors in lines 76-80 and 80-84 and throughout the text. Premium-level editing of the entire article has also been conducted.

Question 5: The appendix missed quality assessment tool for cross-sectional studies and GRADE /Risk bias assessment tool.

Response: Regarding quality assessment, we added the following three tables in the supplemental material:

1. The Newcastle-Ottawa-Scale (NOS) tool for cohort/case-control studies (Supplement table 3);
2. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)-recommended eleven items for cross-sectional studies (Supplement table 4); and
3. The GRADE/Risk bias assessment tool (Supplement table 5).

We also described this in the revised manuscript; please see lines 236-247, pages 12-13.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Santa Cirmi

Institution and Country: University of Messina

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

General comments

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The paper "Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Risk of Asthma in Offspring: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis" by Ping and co-workers described a systematic review protocol aimed to summarize the available evidence examining the association between hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and the risk of asthma in offspring.

This study is interesting and will be the first systematic review and meta-analysis on this topic.

However some points need to be improved before being publishable:

Question 1: The Authors must specify in the title that the paper is a protocol;

Response: We have specified that the paper is a protocol in the title. Please see lines 1-2, page 1.

Question 2: The protocol need to be registered in Prospero;

Response: We submitted this protocol for registration in Prospero in April 2019. However, there has not yet been a reply from PROSPERO.

Question 3: The Authors should included the dates of the study in the manuscript;

Response: We have specified the dates of the study in the abstract and methods. Please see line 34, page 2 and line 189-190, page 10.

Question 4: The Authors should provide a flow chart of the study;

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. The flow chart of the study selection process will be applied in the systematic review according to the PRISMA 2009 flow diagram, which has been listed in Supplement figure 1.

Question 5: Authors should to revise the English because some grammatical errors occur in the whole text.

Response: The grammatical errors have been revised throughout the text. Premium-level language editing of the entire article has been conducted by 'American Journal Experts'.

Reviewer: 3

Reviewer Name: Michele Navarra

Institution and Country: University of Messina, Messina, Italy

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

General comments

The paper "Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy and Risk of Asthma in Offspring: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis" by Ping et al., is a systematic review protocol to conduct it on

hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and the risk of asthma in offspring.
 In my opinion, some points should be addressed in the paper before it being published:

Question 1: The Authors should indicate in the title that the paper is a “protocol” and they should provide the PROSPERO registration number;

Response: We have indicated that the paper is a protocol in the title. Please see lines 1-2, page 1. In addition, we submitted this protocol for registration in Prospero in April 2019. However, there has not yet been a reply from PROSPERO.

Question 2: The Authors should provide a flow chart of the study.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. The flow chart of the study has been added to Supplement figure 1.

Question 3: In addition, a revision of English is strictly recommended.

Response: The grammatical errors have been revised throughout the text. Premium-level language editing of the entire article has been performed by ‘American Journal Experts’.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Berihun Dachew Curtin University, School of Public Health
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Mar-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you gain for the opportunity to review this systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. The authors adequately addressed my comments and improved their manuscript.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Santa Cirimi Department of Chemical, Biological Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences University of Messina I-98168 Messina, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	16-Mar-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors have responded to most of this reviewer's concerns and the paper is now suitable for publication.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Michele Navarra Department of Chemical, Biological, Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences University of Messina I-98168, Messina, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Mar-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors are answered appropriately my points.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Berihun Dachew

Institution and Country: Curtin University, School of Public Health

Please state any competing interests or state ‘None declared’: None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you gain for the opportunity to review this systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. The authors adequately addressed my comments and improved their manuscript.

Response: We appreciate for the Reviewer`s time and help for improving the quality of our manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Santa Cirmi

Institution and Country:

Department of Chemical, Biological Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences

University of Messina

I-98168 Messina, Italy

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The authors have responded to most of this reviewer's concerns and the paper is now suitable for publication.

Response: Thank you very much for the excellent and professional revision of our manuscript.

Reviewer: 3

Reviewer Name: Michele Navarra

Institution and Country:

Department of Chemical, Biological, Pharmaceutical and Environmental Sciences

University of Messina

I-98168, Messina, Italy

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The authors are answered appropriately my points.

Response: We appreciate the careful reading of our manuscript and valuable suggestions of the Reviewer.