

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)	Effects of different surgical treatments on children with ankyloglossia : protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis
AUTHORS	YU, chongqing; Li, Qi-Qi; Zhang, Ruo-Zhen; Chen, Sheng-Lan; Xia, Fei-Fei; Zhou, Zheng

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Messner, Anna to Baylor College of Medicine BCM
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Jul-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	This study proposed to look at various surgical treatments for ankyloglossia. While the study protocol for the systematic review is clear there are few high-quality studies in this area and I think it is highly unlikely that the authors will conclude anything that has not already been said in the past.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Inostroza-Allende, Felipe Universidad de Chile
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Sep-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	I suggest the authors include in the search and in Table 1 if postoperative speech-language therapy was performed (yes/no/not informed). In addition, I suggest you include a column for complications and leave the results separate, within these they consider that each study may have a result of speech, mobility, suction, among others, so they assign more space or distribute said information. On the other hand, it would be interesting to see which aspect is used more to report results. By controlling these variables you will be able to achieve your goal in a better way.
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1: This study proposed to look at various surgical treatments for ankyloglossia. While the study protocol for the systematic review is clear there are few high-quality studies in this area and I think it is highly unlikely that the authors will conclude anything that has not already been said in the past.

Response to comment: We cannot deny the fact that few high-quality studies may indeed affect the conclusion of our study. But we just intend to find out the best surgical treatment for ankyloglossia patients. Taken this into consideration, we firmly believe that we could do a good study to help ankyloglossia patients choose the best surgical procedure.

Reviewer #2:I suggest the authors include in the search and in Table 1 if postoperative speech-language therapy was performed (yes/no/not informed). In addition, I suggest you include a column for complications and leave the results separate, within these they consider that each study may have a result of speech, mobility, suction, among others, so they assign more space or distribute said information. On the other hand, it would be interesting to see which aspect is used more to report results. By controlling these variables you will be able to achieve your goal in a better way

Response to comment: Firstly,we are very willing to include postoperative speech-language therapy in Table 1, and the revised section was highlighted.

In addition, we agree with your advice that different results should be separate, and you could see revised portion highlighted.But as for the complication, we have read lots of relevant and drawn a conclusion that complications could be involved in the results.Besides,we have tried our best to control variables,but there were still some variables that we cannot change.But when we conduct this meta-analysis, we will concentrate on the different variables and control them.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

We have tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript.These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.And here we did not list the changes but highlighted in revised paper.