

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)	Quality assessment of clinical practice guidelines for perioperative care and use of GRADE: a systematic review protocol
AUTHORS	Kantorová, Lucia; Kantor, Jiří; Bůřil, Jiří; Bůřilová, Petra; SLEZAKOVA, Simona; Nečas, Tomáš; KLUGAR, Milolav

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Finkel, Madelon Weill Cornell Medical College
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Jun-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>An interesting project, which is clearly important to the host institution and country. Did you check the Cochrane systematic review database?</p> <p>The methodology is clearly stated.</p> <p>I think it would help if the authors provided more background information about the AGREE II tool for the reader. Who developed it? When? How has it been used? Provide a frame of reference for this tool please.</p> <p>Line 47: include CPGs of any quality seems broad. How is one defining 'quality'?</p> <p>Lines 53-54: could the authors give a one sentence explanation of the difference between identifiable recommendations and good practice statements.</p> <p>I have no objections to the publication of this manuscript.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Kirkovski, Aleksandar Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a protocol for a systematic review that aims to assess the methodological quality of clinical practice guidelines for general perioperative care in the adult population using the AGREE II tool and to investigate the use of GRADE.</p> <p>The protocol follows closely the PRISMA-P checklist. It describes the rationale for the systematic review and clearly states the objective in the Introduction. In the Methods section, it expands on the eligibility criteria with enough detail and the inclusion and exclusion criteria are explicit. It lists what data will be extracted, how many reviewers are going to do the extraction and quality assessment, and how will they solve any uncertainties or conflicts. There is a clear explanation how the data will be summarized and reported. The databases that will be used (including the grey literature) are stated and there is a draft search strategy with keywords and related terms.</p>
-------------------------	--

	One thing to note, the authors should clarify how they would handle the clinical practice guidelines written in different languages.
REVIEWER	HUBNER, Martin CHUV LAusanne
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Oct-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	Quality assessment of practical guidelines are an important topic, as guidelines have an important impact on clinical practice. The authors should therefore be congratulated for their initiative and the suggested methodology should allow to achieve the goal. While publication of trial protocols are important for RCTs, the aim of publishing the protocol only for this study is unclear. I would suggest to perform the review and submit then the paper including results and conclusions. For this submission, revision by an English reader is strongly advised. Congratulations for the initiative, looking forward to see the results of this important study!

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

We have added a search in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR).

We have added one more paragraph on the AGREE II instrument in the introduction.

We have deleted the sentence saying we will include CPGs of any quality. We meant to say that all eligible guidelines will be assessed using the AGREE II instrument and we agree that such information is too broad and redundant, and does not belong in that section.

We have explained what we meant by "identifiable recommendations" and "good practice statements".

We greatly appreciate Prof. Finkel's suggestions and highly value the time spent reviewing our manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

We have added an explanation of the method to be used when including guidelines written in languages other than English.

We greatly appreciate Dr. Kirkovski's suggestions and time spent with our manuscript.

Reviewer: 3

We have had the manuscript proofread by an English native speaker and used Grammarly Pro to correct any spelling and grammar errors.

We are highly appreciative of Dr. Hubner's kind words and time, and we will be delighted to share the results when they are ready.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Finkel, Madelon Weill Cornell Medical College
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Nov-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for taking the time to review your manuscript and address the concerns stated by the reviewers. i think that the edits made are an improvement to the piece. It should be a useful and important study.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Kirkovski, Aleksandar Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Nov-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors clarified how they would manage the clinical practice guidelines written in different languages.
-------------------------	--