

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)	Effectiveness of educational interventions on hypertensive patients' self-management behaviours: an umbrella review protocol
AUTHORS	Ukoha-kalu, Blessing; Isah, Abdulmuminu; Biambo, Aminu; Samaila, Aliyu; Abubakar, Mustapha; Kalu, Ukoha; Soyiri, Ireneous

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Calvin Kalun Or The University of Hong Kong, Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engr.
REVIEW RETURNED	27-Jun-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The paper presents a protocol for a review study. My comments are as follows.</p> <p>This is awkward: Ethics and dissemination: We hope to publish this umbrella review in a peer-reviewed journal. The findings will also be presented as conference papers.</p> <p>For “education interventions”, please be more specific. Are they about technology? Or traditional paper-based interventions? Or both? Or something else?</p> <p>Please enhance the literature review by presenting the main similarities and differences between existing review studies in the same context and your protocol. There are some relevant studies that the authors can mention and cite: https://mhealth.jmir.org/2020/8/e15779/ https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10916-016-0437-1 https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-7-55%E%BB%BF</p> <p>This has no content: Detect significant findings that are repeated or related in various systematic reviews</p> <p>For “or at least 50% of the review’s participants must be at least 18 years”, that means the review could include hypertensive patients who are younger than 18 years of age. Is that what the authors would want to do? Same concern to the other criteria about 50% of the population.</p> <p>Discussion needs to be significantly improved.</p> <p>1st paragraph in discussion – “We hope to publish this umbrella review in a peer- reviewed journal. The findings will also be presented as conference papers” should be removed. These sentences provide little technical contents to readers.</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>For a certain outcome, what if the review studies included used different measures, then how are the authors going to pool them in the analysis?</p> <p>What would be the expected study limitations? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the review study?</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer's comments	
This is awkward: Ethics and dissemination: We hope to publish this umbrella review in a peer-reviewed journal. The findings will also be presented as conference papers	Thank you for your comment. We have now rephrased the 'Ethics and dissemination'.
For "education interventions", please be more specific. Are they about technology? Or traditional paper-based interventions? Or both? Or something else?	Thank you for your comment. We have now specified what we mean by 'educational intervention'. See lines
Please enhance the literature review by presenting the main similarities and differences between existing review studies in the same context and your protocol. There are some relevant studies that the authors can mention and cite: https://mhealth.jmir.org/2020/8/e15779/ https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10916-016-0437-1 https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-7-55%E2%BB%BF	Thank you for your comment. We have now enhanced the literature review using recommended studies.
For "or at least 50% of the review's participants must be at least 18 years", that means the review could include hypertensive patients who are younger than 18 years of age. Is that what the authors would want to do? Same concern to the other criteria about 50% of the population.	Thank you for your comment. The review will only include patients who are 18 years or older.

	We have now clarified this.
Discussion needs to be significantly improved.	
1st paragraph in discussion – “We hope to publish this umbrella review in a peer- reviewed journal. The findings will also be presented as conference papers” should be removed. These sentences provide little technical contents to readers.	Thank you for your comment. We have now removed this sentence.
For a certain outcome, what if the review studies included used different measures, then how are the authors going to pool them in the analysis?	Thank you for your comment. We have now explained this in ‘data analysis’
What would be the expected study limitations? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the review study?	Thank you for your comment. We have now provided the expected limitations for our study as well as the strengths and weaknesses of this umbrella review.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Calvin Kalun Or The University of Hong Kong, Industrial and Manufacturing Systems Engr.
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jul-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>My last comment was not fully address. I see that the authors only mentioned one of the 3 suggestions: Please enhance the literature review by presenting the main similarities and differences between existing review studies in the same context and your protocol. There are some relevant studies that the authors can mention and cite: https://mhealth.jmir.org/2020/8/e15779/ https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10916-016-0437-1 https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-7-55%E1%BB%BF</p> <p>Since the article is a research protocol. For tasks that will be conducted, please use future tense to describe them. For example, We confirm that all methods were performed following the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. All the methods were already performed? I am confused.</p>
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

My last comment was not fully address. I see that the authors only mentioned one of the 3 suggestions: Please enhance the literature review by	Thank you for your comment. We have now enhanced the literature review section.
---	---

presenting the main similarities and differences between existing review studies in the same context and your protocol.	
Since the article is a research protocol. For tasks that will be conducted, please use future tense to describe them. For example, We confirm that all methods were performed following the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki. All the methods were already performed? I am confused.	Thank you for your comment. This is a mistake, and we have now corrected it.