

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)	Protocol of a Scoping Review of Outcome Domains in Dermatology
AUTHORS	Nadir, Umer; Ahmed, Areeba; Yi, Michael D.; Hisham, Farhana Ikmal; Dave, Loma; Kottner, Jan; Ezzedine, K; Garg, Amit; Ingram, John; Jemec, Gregor; Spuls, Phyllis; Kirkham, Jamie J.; Cahn, Brian; Alam, Murad

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Erin Foster Oregon Health & Science University
REVIEW RETURNED	07-Nov-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thanks to the authors to working together as an international group to investigate and describe the current dermatologic COS environment. This work will greatly simplify the work of future COS groups.</p> <p>Minor Revisions and Clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- "COSs" is distracting and incorrect. The term COS stands for both singular and plural Core Outcome Sets. -- PubMed is an interface to access Medline; both searches do not need to be performed (Table and manuscript both cite PubMed, but table also has Medline). Medline is the correct database. -- Has a medical librarian evaluated your search string? I would recommend this step as crucial for any scoping review, in terms of further defining MeSH terms, exploding sub-categories and capturing all of the outcomes you seek. -- Additional limitations: quality of COS work will vary and will not be assessed by your study. -- Thematic grouping should be performed individually by at least 2-3 researchers, then discussed and disagreements resolved either by consensus or an additional author. Please clarify which type of process you will follow. -- This is going to be a very large project. I am glad the extracted data fields will be limited. I would like more information on how the Steering Committee will "map" the results.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Robert A. Swerlick Emory University
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Dec-2023

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an important study to undertake. I have no recommended modifications or criticisms of their strategy.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author (Required)):

-- "COSs" is distracting and incorrect. The term COS stands for both singular and plural Core Outcome Sets.

In light of your recommendation, we have reviewed the whole manuscript and corrected it.

-- PubMed is an interface to access Medline; both searches do not need to be performed (Table and manuscript both cite PubMed, but table also has Medline). Medline is the correct database.

Thank you for pointing out the unnecessary duplication. We have revised our table and included additional databases (Web of Science and Scopus) for a more comprehensive search.

-- Has a medical librarian evaluated your search string? I would recommend this step as crucial for any scoping review, in terms of further defining MeSH terms, exploding sub-categories and capturing all of the outcomes you seek.

Thank you for your recommendation regarding the involvement of a medical librarian in the development of our search strategy. We have consulted such a librarian, included the revised search strategy, and added the comment below:

"The search strategy for each database and website, developed after consultation with a medical librarian, is presented in Table 1."

-- Additional limitations: quality of COS work will vary and will not be assessed by your study.

Thank you for pointing out the limitations concerning the assessment of the quality of COS work in our study. We agree that this is an important limitation to acknowledge:.

"An additional limitation is the quality of COS work can vary and will not be assessed in this study."

-- Thematic grouping should be performed individually by at least 2-3 researchers, then discussed and disagreements resolved either by consensus or an additional author. Please clarify which type of process you will follow.

Thank you for your recommendation on the process of thematic grouping in our study. We recognize the importance of a rigorous and transparent approach to ensure the validity and reliability of our findings. We have rewritten this as follows: "To ensure the integrity of thematic analysis, this process will involve independent thematic grouping by two researchers. Each researcher will identify potential themes, engage in a consensus-based discussion to resolve any discrepancies, and consult a third author if necessary."

-- This is going to be a very large project. I am glad the extracted data fields will be limited. I would like more information on how the Steering Committee will "map" the results.

Thank you for asking that we clarify the mapping process to be undertaken by the Steering Committee. We have included the following:

"To map the results, the Steering Committee will use a systematic approach involving nine steps: (1) each analyst will independently scrutinize the list to verify the accuracy and relevance of the themes identified; (2) notes and insights will be discussed among the team members, resulting in codes (thematic categories) that formed the basis of a preliminary codebook (list of codes and definitions); (3) the codebook will be used to systematically code the source documents line by line, with each

document coded by a minimum of 2 analysts; (4) key themes will be identified and their importance rated to determine the most crucial factors; (5) discrepancies in coding will be resolved during group discussion, and the codebook refined when needed; (6) the coding will be done iteratively, with continuous reviews of additional source documents for further refinement of the codebook; (7) data obtained from coding later source documents will be compared with initial ones to identify the point of thematic saturation, where no new themes emerged; (8) following the coding of all documents, a final review will be conducted to ensure no themes were missed; (9) finally, the findings and themes derived from this comprehensive analysis served as the foundation for developing a conceptual model representing the spectrum of outcome domains in dermatology research.”

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Erin Foster Oregon Health & Science University
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Jan-2024
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for making the requested changes. I am glad that your group is supported by C3, specifically Dr. Kottner, and am looking forward to reading the results of this study!