

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)	Network meta-analysis of four kinds of traditional Chinese exercise therapy in the treatment of type 2 diabetes: protocol for a systematic review
AUTHORS	jia, yuqi; yu, ying; Huang, Hailiang

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Yiming Hao Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Mar-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	In this paper, the authors compared the different effects of four kinds of traditional Chinese exercises as adjuvant therapies on type 2 diabetes by using network meta-analysis, which had good clinical significance. However, there are some shortcomings as follows: 1. There is no research results in the abstract and text. 2. There is no discussion about the results in the discussion part. 3. In the flow diagram of study, the number of samples obtained in each research step is omitted. 4. There are some grammatical errors in the paper, which need to be improved.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Lirong Guo Jilin University, School of Nursing
REVIEW RETURNED	14-Apr-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	1、 Why do Chinese and English databases use different search terms ? 2、 The content of subgroup analysis is not mentioned in the article. 3、 The included literature mainly comes from mainland China.Are the results applicable to other races? 4、 What are the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria?
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Replies to Reviewer 1:

1. There is no research results in the abstract and text.
2. There is no discussion about the results in the discussion part.
3. In the flow diagram of study, the number of samples obtained in each research step is omitted.

Answer: Thank you for your valuable comments. The reason leading to these three problems is that the manuscript we submitted was a protocol, which was a plan for the network meta-analysis of type 2 diabetes in middle-aged and elderly people with 4 traditional Chinese exercise therapies. We are currently proceeding in accordance with the Protocol plan, and the number of samples obtained in

each research step is not clear, so we omitted the relevant sample number in the flow diagram of the study. Because we did not get clear results and conclusions, we did not have the research results in the abstract and did not discuss the results in the discussion section. After the research is completed, we will submit the full-text content as soon as possible to complete the relevant information.

4. There are some grammatical errors in the paper, which need to be improved.

Answer: We have done the English editing with the help of the editing company before the last submission. Due to our negligence, however, we could not find some grammatical and expression errors. We have corrected the grammatical errors we found. If necessary, we will do English polishing again.

Reply to reviewer 2:

1. Why do Chinese and English databases use different search terms?

Answer: As described in the Information sources section, we will try our best to keep the Chinese and English search terms consistent while searching. To search more comprehensively, however, we use subject terms and free words to search the database; in each database, the search methods are different. There may be multiple free words for a subject word in the English database, so the Chinese and English search terms are inconsistent.

2. The content of subgroup analysis is not mentioned in the article.

Answer: We paid attention to this issue. We have added information about subgroup analysis under the heading of subgroup and sensitivity analysis on page 9 of the new manuscript.

3. The included documents are mainly from mainland China, are the results applicable to other races?

Answer: Our research is currently in progress and has yet to get the final results. We are not sure whether we will eventually include relevant research on other races. We will strictly follow the eligibility criteria established in the manuscript to screen the included studies, and we will also actively report on the results of studies involving other races.

4. What are the specific inclusion and exclusion criteria?

Answer: We moved the Eligibility criteria section to page 4 and added the Inclusion criteria sub-heading and Exclusion criteria content (page 5) to clarify the Eligibility criteria. The design of the inclusion and exclusion criteria of this study was based on the five main principles of the Participant-Intervention-Comparator-Outcomes-Study (PICOS) design search principle.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Yiming Hao Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Jun-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	The author has revised the manuscript on the recommendation of the reviewers. Now the manuscript can be accepted.