

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)	Comparative efficacy of 13 immunosuppressive agents for idiopathic membranous nephropathy in adults with nephrotic syndrome: a systematic review and network meta-analysis
AUTHORS	Zheng, qiyan; Yang, Huisheng; Liu, weijing; Sun, weiwei; Zhao, qing; Zhang, xiaoxiao; Jin, Huanan; Sun, Ying

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Nigar Sekercioglu McMaster University
REVIEW RETURNED	28-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear Editor:</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript: "Comparative efficacy of 13 immunosuppressive agents for idiopathic membranous nephropathy in adults with nephrotic syndrome: a systematic review and network meta-analysis."</p> <p>This paper presents a systematic review on clinical effectiveness of various immunosuppressive agents in patients with idiopathic membranous nephropathy</p> <p>My comments are below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following sentence is not clear: "Uncertainty affected by heterogeneity was defined as disagreement between the CIs of relative treatment effects and their predictive intervals." How predictive intervals can be used to assess heterogeneity. 2. The authors stated they used the GRADE approach, but the quality table shows the quality assessment for pairwise comparisons.
-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Yang Cao, Associate Professor Örebro University, Sweden
REVIEW RETURNED	06-May-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a very well-written paper comparing the effectiveness of immunosuppressive agents used to treat idiopathic membranous nephropathy (IMN). The authors included 46 RCTs and 13 types of immunosuppressive agents in the network meta-analysis, and identified the most efficacious agents. The methodology applied in the study is sound and the paper is very interesting to read. However, the limitation of the network meta-analysis should be addressed in detail in the manuscript.</p>
-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1

1. In Supplement 3, we evaluated the heterogeneity and inconsistency of all outcomes in detail. Predictive interval plot that incorporates the extent of heterogeneity was used to evaluate the extent of uncertainty in the estimated effect size locally [Chaimani A, Salanti G. Visualizing assumptions and results in network meta-analysis: The network graphs package. *Stata Journal*. 2015;15(4):905-950.]. We defined heterogeneity as disagreement between the CIs of relative treatment effects and their predictive intervals.
2. In Supplement 6, We evaluated the GRADE evidence for each outcomes using the method of Salanti G and her colleagues. [Salanti G, Del GC, Chaimani A, et al. Evaluating the quality of evidence from a network meta-analysis. *Plos One*. 2014;9(7):A324.]

Reviewer #2

We have supplemented the deficiencies of our network meta-analysis in this paper.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Yang Cao Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Sweden
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Jul-2019
GENERAL COMMENTS	My comments were fully addressed in the revision. I recommend for publication.