

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 19343

Title: Application of meta-analysis to specific research fields: Lessons learned

Reviewer's code: 02458583

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-07 19:37

Date reviewed: 2015-05-23 00:13

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

-

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 19343

Title: Application of meta-analysis to specific research fields: Lessons learned

Reviewer's code: 02549882

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-07 19:37

Date reviewed: 2015-05-11 13:25

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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

NO remarkable criticism for this manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 19343

Title: Application of meta-analysis to specific research fields: Lessons learned

Reviewer's code: 02455405

Reviewer's country: Belgium

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-07 19:37

Date reviewed: 2015-05-15 13:51

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Author, Your paper is a well justified paper as it is addressing important concerns on meta-analysis scope. I regret not to see more such papers, most of the methodological papers in meta-analysis discussing on differences between statistical optimization process or model adequacy, but they are almost never deal with pooling questions. In the same way, guidelines like PRISMA and others restrain on basic questions and also focus exagerately on some topics as randomization procedures. My critics are 1-The whole body of the text is devoted to question as to whether pooling or not data, and this is a very valuable topic to deal with. I should have preferred this objective directly mentioned in the introduction, instead of this initial discussion that the public frequently voices their frustration when the media reports a treatment working on one day, but seemingly the next day reports a study refuting the previous one. 2- I think that this paper underlines a very important question on pooling or not categories of drugs or type of diseases, but this question refers more to meta-analysts and not the public. It is true that too many meta-analyses are based on very discutable pooling of this kind and it was important to show how this may induce differences in the results. 3- However, this question has only a few to deal with how public

understands meta-analysis. Although I agree that very few people may understand the contents of a meta-analysis, I think this is not the question here. My feeling is that even much less people are able to understand these concepts, but is scientific literature done for that? Articles are -in my opinion- essentially to convey information among scientists, to every one his/her job, and other journals such as well known magazines are probably better adapted to communicate simplified results to the whole world. 4- The enumeration of meta-analyses showing the inconsistency between them is useful and provides a clear demonstration of the danger to pooling species or types of diseases without a pre-defined rationale. However, the paper should much improve if the author should provides some recommendation to avoid these problems. In the same time, when describing the difficulty and pitfalls of pooling, the author may mention how a random model can help. 5- The author also mentions that subgroups are needed. I agree with this point. To provide an even better paper, I think the author should mention methods to perform this sub group analysis. As mathematical statistician, I think the way meta-analysts are currently doing this subgroup analysis is often criticizable. First, these subgroups should be identified at the protocol level to avoid fishing expedition, but also, adequate analyses must be used. Perhaps the author may describe in some words how meta-regression may help in this matter. in conclusin, good and interesting paper, needing minor revision in particular on the methodological aspect