

## 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

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Disparities in the completion of steps to kidney transplantation: protocol for a systematic review
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Traino, Heather; Nonterah, Camilla; Cyrus, John; Gillespie, Avrum; Urbanski, Megan; Adair-Kriz, Michael

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Pandey, Prashant JAYPEE HOSPITAL, NOIDA-INDIA
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	09-Jul-2015

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>In modern era of transplant medicine where there is deficient supply of organ and the world is looking after different options of organ transplant like live related donor transplants and ABO-incompatible transplants, this kind of disparity, ideally should not be. Incorporation of PRISMA guidelines and cochrane systematic review have helped a lot in reducing the selection biases and understanding the barriers to living kidney donation among racial and ethnic minorities</p> <p>To increase parity in cases of solid organ transplants systematic reviews like this, are required. A systematic planning and sincere deliberation put in this manuscript is one of the best examples of team effort.</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	W. James Chon University of Chicago
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	16-Jul-2015

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.
-------------------------	--

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1. Issue: Scope is too general and vague

The manuscript now includes the specific research question underpinning this review (p. 2). We have also narrowed the range of study designs eligible for inclusion in the review to exclude any type of experimental study (p. 2).

2. Issue: PRISMA misattribution

The revised manuscript corrects our original misattribution of the PRISMA guidelines to the conduct of systematic reviews (p. 2 and p. 6).

3. Issue: Likelihood of a meta-analysis

We agree that a meta-analysis is unlikely and have removed mention of this type of quantitative analysis from the protocol (p. 6).

4. Issue: Outcomes are unclear

We have clarified our description of the outcomes of the review (p. 5).

5. Issue: Analyses are unclear

We have provided additional detail regarding our plan for qualitative analyses (pp. 5-6).