

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)	Effect of systemic bisphosphonate administration on patients with periodontal disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol
AUTHORS	Koide, Yoko; Kataoka, Yu; Hasegawa, Takeshi; Ota, Erika; Noma, Hisashi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Rathod, Surekha VSPM Dental College and Research Centre, Periodontics and Implant Dentistry
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Oct-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	followed all guidelines for each and every step for writing protocol, need minor statistical corrections
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Dioguardi, Mario University of Foggia
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Oct-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Major review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being a protocol based on PRISMA-p, it is strongly recommended to rewrite the revision following the precise subdivision into paragraphs of the (checklist) proposed by Prisma-p. <p>Minor review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subgroup analysis: Because in the subgroup analyzes you did not suggest an analysis based on the underlying pathology of the patient for whom the drug is administered (osteoporosis, neoplasia, etc.)? 2. Registration: you have suggested registering only on Scopus but there are also other review registries. 3. Assessment of heterogeneity: in case of heterogeneity, a graphical analysis of the confidence intervals could also be recommended to verify if there is an overlap with homogeneity of the studies. (I would like to know an opinion of the authors in this regard) 4. Meta-regression: specify the number according to which it is indicated to perform a meta-regression 5. PRISMA -p checklist Objectives 7 Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO).
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Surekha Rathod, VSPM Dental College and Research Centre

Comments to the Author:

followed all guidelines for each and every step for writing protocol, need minor statistical corrections

Thank you for the valuable comments. We have followed the PRISMA-P guideline for writing the protocol (noted at p. 9, lines 171-174). As per the suggestions by Reviewer 2, minor corrections were made in the 'Strategy for data synthesis' section (p. 14-15, lines 302-310).

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Mario Dioguardi, University of Foggia

Comments to the Author:

Major review

- Being a protocol based on PRISMA-p, it is strongly recommended to rewrite the revision following the precise subdivision into paragraphs of the (checklist) proposed by Prisma-p.

We have added an 'OBJECTIVES' section (p. 9, lines 171-174). We have deleted the last sentence of 'Why is this review important?' in the 'INTRODUCTION' section (p. 9, lines 167-169).

Minor review

1. Subgroup analysis: Because in the subgroup analyzes you did not suggest an analysis based on the underlying pathology of the patient for whom the drug is administered (osteoporosis, neoplasty, etc.)?

We have reconsidered the original text and added the item of different pathology administered bisphosphonates (osteoporosis, multiple myeloma, Paget's disease, malignant hypercalcemia, osteogenesis imperfecta, suppression of progressive ectopic ossification after traumatic nerve injury, severe neuropathy, and hip arthroplasty) in the 'Subgroup analysis' section (p. 16-17, lines 351-354).

2. Registration: you have suggested registering only on Scopus but there are also other review registries.

We have already registered this study with PROSPERO and obtained an ID (p. 5, lines 76-77; p. 9, lines 181-182; p. 18, lines 386-387).

3. Assessment of heterogeneity: in case of heterogeneity, a graphical analysis of the confidence intervals could also be recommended to verify if there is an overlap with homogeneity of the studies. (I would like to know an opinion of the authors in this regard)

Thank you for this comment. We have added the graphical analysis in the 'Assessment of heterogeneity' section (p. 16, lines 329-331, 340-342).

4. Meta-regression: specify the number according to which it is indicated to perform a meta-regression

We have specified the number to be considered for the meta-regression analyses on p.16, lines 331-342.

5. PRISMA -p checklist Objectives 7 Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO).

We have added an 'OBJECTIVES' section (p. 9, lines 171-174). We have deleted the last sentence of 'Why is this review important?' in the 'INTRODUCTION' section (p. 9, lines 167-169).

Sincerely,

Yoko Koide, D.D.S, Ph.D.

Department of Periodontology, Showa University School of Dentistry

2-1-1, Kitasenzoku, Ota-ku, Tokyo, 145-8515, Japan

Email: koide64@dent.showa-u.ac.jp

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Dioguardi, Mario University of Foggia
REVIEW RETURNED	20-Dec-2021
GENERAL COMMENTS	The authors answered all questions asked and edited the manuscript where appropriate. I believe the manuscript is published in this form