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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overview Protocol title |  |
| Name and specialism of peer reviewer |  |
| Date sent to peer reviewer: |  |
| Date to be returned to editorial base: |  |

Thank you for agreeing to comment on this **protocol** for a Cochrane Overview. Protocols are published first and indicate the intention to carry out a review. Cochrane Overviews of Reviews (Overviews) are intended primarily to summarize multiple systematic reviews addressing the effects of two or more potential interventions for a single condition or health problem. You can read more about Overviews in [Chapter 22](http://handbook.cochrane.org/index.htm#chapter_22/22_overviews_of_reviews.htm) of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*.

This checklist is not suitable for commenting on a Cochrane Intervention Review, a Network Meta-Analysis (NMA) Review, or a Diagnostic Test Accuracy (DTA) Review.

This checklist provides guidance on the areas we would like you to comment on, but feel free to comment on any aspect of the manuscript. Note that the Overview will be copy-edited before publication. Please keep this Overview Protocol copy confidential. Further information on the Cochrane Peer Review policy is available from the Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource (<http://community.cochrane.org/editorial-and-publishing-policy-resource/cochrane-review-management/cochrane-peer-review-policy>).

Cochrane Overviews have a highly structured format and authors are expected to follow this format. Each protocol needs to be explicit and comprehensive. Please consider whether the planned action is appropriate and fits in with the objectives of the Overview.

**If you have any questions or queries, please contact Liliana Coco at: liliana.coco@istituto-besta.it**

## Title/objectives

|  |
| --- |
| * Is the Overview question important to consumers, policy makers and healthcare providers? * Does the title reflect the objectives, and vice versa? * Do the methods enable the review authors to address the objectives? |
| **Comment:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Background

|  |
| --- |
| * Does the background section describe the global health issue, including incidence and prevalence, how it occurs, who is affected (including high-risk groups, vulnerable/disadvantaged populations), where it occurs, how it is diagnosed, and what the symptoms and consequences are? * Does the intervention explanation include how interventions may have an impact on potential recipients and how they work (if relevant)? * Does the background state the rationale for the Overview? Does it address issues that are important for consumers (including policy-makers)? * Are the supporting references current and do they provide an international picture of the problem? |
| **Comment:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Criteria for considering reviews for inclusion in this Overview

|  |
| --- |
| **Participants, interventions, and comparators**   * Are the types of reviews to be included described? * Are the types of reviews appropriate to the clinical question? * Do the main outcome measures make good clinical sense to you? * Are the participants adequately described and are the reasons for any restrictions appropriate? * Are the study interventions and comparators clearly described and is their selection appropriate? |
| **Comment:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Search methods for identification of reviews

|  |
| --- |
| * Will there be a thorough unrestricted search for relevant reviews using appropriate sources? * Are there any additional resources that should be searched (e.g. additional databases to the CDSR, if non-Cochrane reviews are to be included)?   *[N.B.: if only Cochrane reviews will be included, this will be reflected in the search methods.]* |
| **Comment:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Data collection and analysis

|  |
| --- |
| * Are the criteria used to assess methodological quality of included reviews clearly stated and appropriate? * Have the authors stated they will use the AMSTAR tool? AMSTAR (<http://amstar.ca/Amstar_Checklist.php>) is a measurement tool for the assessment of multiple systematic reviews (Shea at al. [Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews](http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/7/10) *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007;7:10). * Are the criteria used to assess quality of evidence in included reviews clearly stated and appropriate? * Are the planned methods for summarising review results clear and appropriate? * Are any additional analyses clearly described and appropriate? * Have sources of heterogeneity been identified and used to inform the proposed subgroup analyses? * Are particular methodological issues likely to be encountered in the topic area, for which methods have not been described? * Has the review team described appropriate methods for summarising and interpreting their results, including consideration of the overall strength of the evidence, clinical importance of results, contextual factors and considerations of equity? * Do the authors plan to include an ‘Overviews of reviews’ table designed to reflect the ‘Summary of findings’ tables in Cochrane Intervention reviews? |
| **Comments:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Additional comments

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments:** |
| **Author response:** |

## Potential conflicts of interest: Peer reviewer statement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you have any potential conflict of interest?** | **Yes (details below)** | **No** |
| You should declare and describe any present or past affiliations or other involvement in any organisation or entity with an interest in the outcome of the review that might lead to a real or perceived conflict of interest. You should report relationships that were present during the last 36 months, including, but not restricted to, financial remuneration for lectures, consultancy, travel, and whether you are an author of, or contributor to, a study that might be included in this review. You should declare potential conflicts even if you are confident that your judgement is not influenced. | | |
| **Conflict of interest statement:** | | |

## Peer reviewer anonymity and acknowledgement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** |
| I am willing to be identified as the person who gave these comments. *If no, please give reason(s) below.* |  |  |
| I am happy to be acknowledged in the published protocol |  |  |
| I am happy to be acknowledged on the CRG website |  |  |
| Please include your name and affiliation as you wish it to appear: |  | |
| Reasons: | | |

**Please return the full form to the Cochrane Multiple Sclerosis and Rare Diseases of the CNS at:** [liliana.coco@istituto-besta.it](mailto:liliana.coco@istituto-besta.it) **/ via the link in the Archie ticket email.**