

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)	URINARY INCONTINENCE IN OLDER MEN: PROTOCOL FOR A SCOPING REVIEW OF RISK FACTORS
AUTHORS	Olagundoye, Olawunmi; Kung, Janice; Gibson, W.; Wagg, Adrian

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Soulis, George Henry Dunant Hospital Center, Outpatient Geriatric Assessment Unit
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Oct-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>You present a very interesting and potentially useful protocol. My only concern is about the eligibility criteria where you mention "Our review will include sources of evidence identifying the risk factors among older men (65+) with UI. We will exclude data solely from men aged < 65 years of age."</p> <p>By saying so it is not clear how you are going to deal with the studies that include people younger than 65 and older than 65 in the same cohort or two different cohorts of people older than 65 and younger than 65 are at the same study.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	John, Gregor HUG) and Geneva University, Department of Internal Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Nov-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Olagundoye and colleague will preform a systematic review on risk factors for urinary incontinence among men. Although the inclusion and exclusion criteria of article are not obvious, the subject is of interest and the study protocol is well written.</p> <p>I have only few comments for the authors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Line 33 page: I suggest to exclude the narrative reviews of the search strategy (I guess it is what is was meant)- Have you considerate to find specific risk for UI subtype- Have you considerate to perform a quantitative pool analysis, is the nature of the result is sufficiently "comparable", in order to give a summary of the association between factors and UI? If you plane this I suggest to not this in the protocol, and use the MOSSE checklist to.- You say in line 34 of page 7 and in line 7 of page 8 that the review will include article without languages restriction. However, in the search strategy in the appendix I, row 23, you included a restriction to "English" language in the key words.- Could you give precision on the exclusion and inclusion criteria of the retrieved article?
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1	<p>My only concern is about the eligibility criteria where you mention</p> <p>"Our review will include sources of evidence identifying the risk factors among older men (65+) with UI. We will exclude data solely from men aged < 65 years of age."</p> <p>By saying so it is not clear how you are going to deal with the studies that include people younger than 65 and older than 65 in the same cohort or two different cohorts of people older than 65 and younger than 65 are at the same study.</p>	<p>Thank you for your observation.</p> <p>We have revised our inclusion criteria to reflect what was intended and achieved through the search strategy, which was to include all articles containing older men 65+.</p> <p>In the full article review stage, we will exclude articles featuring combined datasets of younger and older men, in which the UI risk factors for older men cannot be extracted due to a lack of age stratification. Similarly, where studies retrieved include information on both men and women, only data stratified by sex will be reported.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria have also been revised.</p>	<p>Page 5, second to the last paragraph</p>
Reviewer 2	<p>Although the inclusion and exclusion criteria of article are not obvious, the subject is of interest and the study protocol is well written.</p>	<p>More clarity has been provided regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria.</p>	<p>Page 5, second to the last paragraph</p>
	<p>Line 33 page: I suggest to exclude the narrative reviews from the search strategy (I guess it is what is was meant)</p>	<p>The protocol was formatted according to JBI's scoping review protocol template, which recommended describing the search strategy in detail.</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>Page 6, paragraphs 1-3</p>
	<p>Have you considered to find specific risk for UI subtype?</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. While the identification of UI subtype-specific risk factors is not our primary objective, we may consider it as an additional finding from the scoping review.</p>	
	<p>Have you considered to perform a quantitative pool analysis, is the nature of the result is sufficiently "comparable", in order to give a summary of the association between factors and UI? If you plan this I suggest to not this in the protocol, and use the MOSSE checklist to.</p>	<p>We appreciate your suggestion, as it represents an important factor to consider if we decide to go beyond a scoping review to a meta-analysis.</p>	
	<p>You say in line 34 of page 7 and in line 7 of page 8 that the review will include article without languages restriction. However, in the search</p>	<p>Row 23 was left in error, and has now been removed. Having detected ≈10% (169 out of 1662) of articles in languages other than English</p>	<p>Appendix 1</p>

	strategy in the appendix I, row 23, you included a restriction to “English” language in the key words.	in the preliminary search, we decided to include all articles without language restrictions.	
	Could you give precision on the exclusion and inclusion criteria of the retrieved article?	More clarity has been provided regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria.	Page 5, second to the last paragraph

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Soulis, George Henry Dunant Hospital Center, Outpatient Geriatric Assessment Unit
REVIEW RETURNED	08-Dec-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	My comments have been adequately addressed.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	John, Gregor HUG) and Geneva University, Department of Internal Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Nov-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for having changed your manuscript according to my suggestions
-------------------------	--