



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 26762

Title: Antibiotics for eradicating meningococcal carriage: Network meta-analysis and investigation of evidence inconsistency

Reviewer’s code: 02976990

Reviewer’s country: Kenya

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-26 16:11

Date reviewed: 2016-05-04 16:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors of this article have done an excellent job in putting together data from multiple studies in this network meta-analysis. The article is well written and the findings are clearly stated. Comments: 1. The greatest weakness of this work is the heterogeneity between studies that has made comparisons very difficult. The meta-analysis combines very divergent groups and attempts to make comparisons some of which are not ideal. In this meta-analysis we have young people, military, and contacts of cases from different regions in terms of disease burden and the study quality also varies a lot. This is the most “tricky” bit of this analysis. This also takes away from the “richness of information” readers will be expecting from this article. I however commend the authors for highlighting these weaknesses and pointing out the causes of inconsistencies such as effect modifiers that would be responsible for some observed results. To deal with the above-mentioned shortcoming, the authors should consider doing sub-group analyses comparing similar studies, groups or doses (where applicable). This will yield more reliable, easily interpretable estimates. 2. I agree with the authors that some of the indirect comparisons may not be valid. I will defer the



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

decision on whether to keep these or exclude them to the authors. 3. Funnel plots are very crucial in meta-analysis. The authors have more than 20 studies, which should be adequate for a funnel plot. I would recommend that they do the funnel plot and include it in the article so that readers can interpret the findings of this meta-analysis with that in mind. 4. On Figure 2 Rifampin is spelt as "Rfampin". kindly rectify this.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 26762

Title: Antibiotics for eradicating meningococcal carriage: Network meta-analysis and investigation of evidence inconsistency

Reviewer's code: 02508408

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-04-26 16:11

Date reviewed: 2016-05-10 06:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well-performed network meta-analysis regarding the effects of antibiotics for eradicating carriage of *Neisseria meningitidis*. The methodology is clear, the meta-analysis was performed well, the article was well-written, and the limitations of the study have been adequately discussed. The findings of this meta-analysis should be useful for the scientific and clinical community.