

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)	Complications in Breast Augmentation with Textured versus Smooth Breast Implants: A Systematic Review Protocol
AUTHORS	Wang, Chenglong; Panayi, Adriana; Orgill, Dennis; Xin, Minqiang

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Max Dieterich, MD, PhD University of Rostock Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Breast Unit Südring 81 18059 Rostock Germany
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Dec-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Comments on: „ Complications in Breast Augmentation with Textured versus smooth Breast Implants: A Systemic Review Protocol”</p> <p>General comments: The authors submitted their research protocol for a Meta-Analysis investigating complication rates in aesthetic breast augmentation comparing smooth vs. textured implants.</p> <p>The manuscript is very well written. No questions arose during the review process. Thank you for having submitted a very good prepared manuscript!</p> <p>Only minor comments regarding the PRISMA-P checklist:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Item No 3b: A clear description of contributions of each author is unclear.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Cicero Urban Positivo University, Brazil.
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a very interesting topic. I think that some outcomes described in the methodology will be difficult to be addressed. One possible and unavoidable bias is patient's follow-up, which tends to be shorter in publications reporting findings in aesthetic patients. Regarding specifically to patient's satisfaction, which is very subjective, it should be clear which kind of report will be accepted in the metanalysis. BREAST-Q could be a good option in this case.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Editor Comments to Author:

Comment 1. Please include an example of the full search strategy as a supplementary file.

Response: A PubMed database full search strategy has been added as a supplementary table.

Comment 2. The Dissemination section at the end of the paper should be Ethics and Dissemination, as per our guidelines for protocols.

Response: The title of this section has been changed as the guideline for protocols.

Reviewer 1:

Comment: Item No 3b: A clear description of contributions of each author is unclear.

Response: Description of each author's contribution has been added at the end of the references.

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1 : I think that some outcomes described in the methodology will be difficult to be addressed. One possible and unavoidable bias is patient's follow-up, which tends to be shorter in publications reporting findings in aesthetic patients.

Response: We agree with you. Different types of complication may be shown in different phases of postoperation. This can be one limitation of this systematic review. The included studies will be divided into different subgroups according to the length of follow-up. If necessary, subgroup analysis will be done.

Comment 2: Regarding specifically to patient's satisfaction, which is very subjective, it should be clear which kind of report will be accepted in the meta-analysis. BREAST-Q could be a good option in this case.

Response: BREAST-Q scale for augmentation will be used to evaluate patients' satisfaction.