
Scientific Reports - Receipt of Manuscript 'Detection Tools for...'

1 message

Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>

Wed, Apr 13, 2022 at 3:20 PM

To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Ref: Submission ID 96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2

Dear Dr Zairina,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Scientific Reports.

Your manuscript is now at our initial Quality Check stage, where we look for adherence to the journal's submission guidelines, including any relevant editorial and publishing policies. If there are any points that need to be addressed prior to progressing we will send you a detailed email. Otherwise, your manuscript will proceed into peer review.

You can check on the status of your submission at any time by using the link below and logging in with the account you created for this submission:

https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions?utm_source=submissions&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=confirmation-email&journal_id=41598

Kind regards,

Peer Review Advisors
Scientific Reports

Springer Nature offers an open access support service to make it easier for our authors to discover and apply for APC funding. For further information please visit <http://www.springemature.com/gp/open-research/funding>

Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

4 messages

Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>

Mon, Jul 4, 2022 at 2:43 PM

To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Ref: Submission ID 96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2

Dear Dr Zairina,

Re: "Detection Tools for Prediction and Identification of Adverse Drug Reactions in Older Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has now passed through the review stage and is ready for revision. Many manuscripts require a round of revisions, so this is a normal but important stage of the editorial process.

Editor comments

The reviews of the two experts consulted show that your work is adequate for the journal but several points need to be amended before definitive acceptance.

To ensure the Editor and Reviewers will be able to recommend that your revised manuscript is accepted, please pay careful attention to each of the comments that have been pasted underneath this email. This way we can avoid future rounds of clarifications and revisions, moving swiftly to a decision.

Once you have addressed each comment and completed each step listed below, please log in here with the same email you used to submit your manuscript to upload the revised submission and final file:

<https://submission.nature.com/submit-revision/96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2>

Alternatively, please visit <https://researcher.nature.com/your-submissions> to upload your revised submission and to track progress of any other submissions you might have.

CHECKLIST FOR SUBMITTING YOUR REVISION

1. Please upload a point-by-point response to the comments, including a description of any additional experiments that were carried out and a detailed rebuttal of any criticisms or requested revisions that you disagreed with. This must be uploaded as a 'Point-by-point response to reviewers' file.

You'll find a handy one-page PDF on how to respond to reviewers' comments here:

https://www.nature.com/documents/Effective_Response_To_Reviewers-1.pdf

2. Please highlight all the amends on your manuscript or indicate them by using tracked changes.

3. Check the format for revised manuscripts in our submission guidelines, making sure you pay particular attention to the figure resolution requirements:

<https://www.nature.com/srep/publish/guidelines>

Finally, if you have been asked to improve the language or presentation of your manuscript and would like the assistance of paid editing services, then our expert help at Springer Nature Author Services can help you improve your manuscript through services including English language editing, developmental comments, manuscript formatting, figure preparation, translation, and more.

To find out more and get 15% off your order then click the link below.

https://authorservices.springernature.com/go/sn/?utm_source=SNAPP&utm_medium=Revision+Email&utm_campaign=SNAS+Referrals+2022&utm_id=ref2022

Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our resources page: <https://www.springernature.com/gp/researchers/campaigns/english-language-forauthors>

To support the continuity of the peer review process, we recommend returning your manuscript to us within 14 days. If you think you will need additional time, please let us know and we will aim to respond within 48 hours.

Kind regards,

Mihaela Delcea
Editorial Board Member
Scientific Reports

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1

The manuscript refers to a systematic review and meta-analysis related to the identification and evaluation of relevant tools related to ADR detection in elderly patients. The work is based on a clearly explained methodology, the statistical results are valid and the advantages and limitations of the study are described. However, there are several changes which must be undertaken. The main issues which were identified in the manuscript were:

- In several places within the manuscript, some statements were not cited (see the list of changes for further details – no. 2 and 5).
- When describing the results reported in the selected studies, there are certain situations (see for example the list of changes – no. 8) where the data are interpreted without mentioning related studies or the context of the findings. For an unbiased interpretation of the results, it is essential that you include such detailed discussions.
- No conclusion section was found within the manuscript.

Therefore, I would recommend the work for publication only after the following changes are made:

- 1) Page 4, Row 46 – Please modify the following phrase: “The coalescence of two or more medications with similar ADR profiles (e.g., hypotension), which is preventable, leads to ADR related hospitalization in the elderly population”. You cannot say that combining two drugs with similar ADR profiles will definitely lead to hospitalization. There are numerous examples of drug combinations with similar ADR profiles which are recommended by the updated clinical guidelines (e.g. ACE inhibitors + thiazide diuretics in the treatment of hypertension, as recommended by the European Society of Cardiology). You must make it clear that you refer to MAJOR drug interactions, especially the contraindicated ones. If you like, you can refer to these updated recommendations: <https://oxfordmedicine.com/view/10.1093/med/9780198759935.001.0001/med-9780198759935-chapter-23>
- 2) Page 4, Row 51 – The references for the Naranjo algorithm and the assessment criteria established by the WHO Uppsala Monitoring Centre are warranted.
- 3) Page 5, Row 67. Please check the word order. It is correct to say “fully reviewed”, not “reviewed fully”. This is only an example, please check and correct other similar errors.
- 4) Page 7, Row 95. You say that “the intervention with STOPP/START or STRIP probably leads to no change in the number of predicted and prevented ADR or AE in elderly patients (moderate evidence quality)”. However, please note, that, as highlighted in the START/STOPP criteria (version 2, 2015), a clinical trial showed a significant ADR risk reduction in the elderly, as well as a reduction in the length of hospital stay by 3 days: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4339726/>

Please check for other similar situations.

- 5) Page 10, Row 157. You mention that there were 3 studies which showed a significant reduction on potential prescribing omissions. Please cite the studies at the end of the phrase. In addition, please check for other similar situations throughout the Results section.
- 6) You must describe if and how the drug-ADR causality was assessed in the selected studies. If it was not formally evaluated, please describe how the confounding risk was reduced.
- 7) Page 14, Row 241. You briefly mention other systematic reviews. However, it is essential that you describe the main differences between these studies and your current work.
- 8) Page 14, Rows 245-248. As mentioned in the list of changes (no. 4), you must mention the context of your findings, especially considering the fact that, as mentioned in the published STOPP/START criteria (version 2), the intervention was validated through a clinical trial: <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT01467050> Therefore, you must either mention these details or provide a valid reason for not including them in the Discussion section.
- 9) The Discussion Section is too short. As mentioned above, more emphasis should be put on the context of the findings, as well as on the comparison between your study and other similar studies. Please discuss these elements in more detail. For example, you say that “the output of this systematic review cannot support the use of any instrument or tool intended to predict or detect ADR for the prevention and reduction of ADR” and afterwards you explain the reason for this. Nevertheless, you must include a “however” statement, mentioning the results obtained in other studies and a few relevant clinical recommendations made (for example) by the Beers and STOPP/START criteria.
- 10) No conclusion section was found within the manuscript. Please include a conclusion section.
- 11) Page 16, Rows 277-284 – Please cite the databases and the PICOT search strategy.
- 12) Page 18, Row 311 – Please cite the software used for data analysis (Review Manager).

Reviewer 2

The authors present a systematic review and meta-analysis on the adverse reaction prediction tools in the elderly population. The studies findings is that there are no assessment tools that reduce number of drug interactions or mortality, so more research is needed. This is novel and important research for a population that is high risk for adverse reactions.

I commend the authors on trying to create a reproducible search strategy for the supplementary. Unfortunately, there are some things that are unclear. For the Web of Science and PubMed Search, these databases have different database commands (which are also not included). Did you search PubMed or Medline on Web of Science? Or did you search Web of Science Core Collection? If you searched Web of Science All Databases, this is your institution's subscription and will need to disclose which databases you have access too.

I'm a little confused by all of the lines here. This could have been broken down to:

Line 25: or/1-5

Line 26: or/6-24

Line 27-32: prevention terms

Line 33: or/27-32

Line 34: 25 or 27 or 33

I also worry about the terms used. I think this search would have been significantly improved with the assistance of a medical librarian with experience in evidence synthesis. For instance, why prevention instead of prevent* (which would capture prevents, which your search misses out on)? Depending on how the authors structured the sentence, you could have missed key resources. You also are inconsistent with the terms used. For instance, some of the searches are missing "older people" and only have "older person", but both terms are included in the CINAHL search. Also what database(s) was/were searched in ProQuest?

The methods section says that you search controlled vocabulary in Medline/Embase - but they are not listed in the search. You have an extra comma in line 282 the database interface is Ovid and the databases are Medline/Embase so Ovid should not be a standalone item in that sentence.

Per PRISMA-S, the search should be less than six months old at time of publication. Please consider running a search update.

"Key search terms consisted of three main concepts: elderly with morbidity, adverse drug reaction prediction and/or detection instruments, polypharmacy, and an in depth list of synonyms, given the variable terminology in the field." This is inaccurate, your concepts are elderly, prediction and detection tools, and prevention. If your inclusion criteria that you screened was more precise, that should be listed separately from the search concepts.

There is a significant number of papers that were excluded due to language. This is more a study limitation than an exclusion reason. This should be clearly stated of the potential publication and location bias by excluding these studies.

Also why were 790 potentially relevant articles not reviewed in full-text? Did the researchers use inter-library loan (typically a free service) to retrieve these? Put out requests on library listservs. This is far too high of a number considering your 18 included studies.

For PRISMA 16b, these excluded studies should be listed individually in the supplement. Especially if you have excluded 790 potentially relevant articles without reviewing them in full-text.

elida zairina <elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id>
To: Dewi Atmaja <dewi.s.atmaja@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 4, 2022 at 2:59 PM

Let's Roll

Best Wishes,
Elida Zairina, MPH, PhD, Apt
Dept of Pharmacy Practice
Faculty of Pharmacy,
Universitas Airlangga,
Surabaya, 60286, East Java, INDONESIA
email: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Begin forwarded message:

From: Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>
Date: 4 July 2022 at 2:43:39 pm GMT+7
To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id
Subject: Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

Ref: Submission ID 96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2
[Quoted text hidden]

elida zairina <elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id>
To: Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>
Bcc: Dewi Atmaja <dewi.s.atmaja@gmail.com>

Wed, Jul 6, 2022 at 2:58 PM

Dear Editor Mihaela Delcea,

Thank you for the email about the decision on our manuscript "Detection Tools for Prediction and Identification of Adverse Drug Reactions in Older Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis". We will make the revision according to the journal guideline and the reviewer's comments. However, I am afraid we need to ask for additional time to submit the revision. Therefore I was wondering if we could get additional time at least 7 more days from the actual deadline?

Thank you for your kindness and I look forward to your reply.

Best wishes,
Elida

Elida Zairina, MPH, PhD
Dept of Pharmacy Practice
Faculty of Pharmacy, Bld. Nanizar Zaman Joenoes
Universitas Airlangga (Kampus C UNAIR)
Jl. Dr.Ir. H. Soekarno
Surabaya 60115, JAWA TIMUR, INDONESIA
Ph: +62 (0) 31 5933150 Fax: + 62 (0) 5935249
E-mail: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

[Quoted text hidden]

Nikita Bandekar <scientific.reports@springernature.com>
Reply-To: Nikita Bandekar <scientific.reports@springernature.com>
To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Thu, Jul 7, 2022 at 2:33 PM

Dear Dr Zairina,

Thank you for your email.

This will not be a problem, we do appreciate that some revisions do take longer than others and we would be more than happy to accommodate an extension for you till 25th July 2022. Please submit your revised manuscript when you are ready.

We prefer our authors to be happy with what they submit

Regards,
Nikita Bandekar
Editorial Support at [Scientific Reports](#)

On Wed, 6 Jul at 8:59 AM , Elida-z <elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id> wrote:

[External - Use Caution]

[Quoted text hidden]

Revision Quality Check: "Detection Tools for Prediction and Identification of Adverse Drug Reactions in Older Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

1 message

Shilpa Shinde <srep@nature.com>
Reply-To: Shilpa Shinde <srep@nature.com>
To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Wed, Jul 20, 2022 at 3:59 PM

Dear Prof. Elida,

Thank you for submitting your revision to Scientific Reports. However, in order to further process your paper, we will require the following to be included:

1. Please note the Supplementary Information will be published as is, without modification or typesetting. Consequently, please do not highlight changes with colours or otherwise in the SI. If you wish to indicate changes made, please upload a separate version as a "Related Manuscript" file, labelled "SI with changes marked".

Kindly access your manuscript via the following link:

<https://submission.nature.com/submission/63af1fa5-927c-4bc8-9e09-9b5727ec7824>

(Press/Click on the above link to be automatically sent to the web page.)

Please make the requested amendments only, before selecting the "Submit manuscript" button on the "Review" page.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Shilpa Shinde

Editorial Support at [Scientific Reports](#)

Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

2 messages

Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>

Mon, Jul 25, 2022 at 6:22 PM

To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Ref: Submission ID 96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2

Dear Dr Zairina,

Re: "Detection Tools for Prediction and Identification of Adverse Drug Reactions in Older Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

We're delighted to let you know your manuscript has now been accepted for publication in Scientific Reports.

Editor comments

The comments of the reviewers have been addressed in an adequate manner.

Licence to Publish and Article Processing Charge

As the corresponding author of an accepted manuscript, your next steps will be to complete an Open Access Licence to publish on behalf of all authors, confirm your institutional affiliation, and arrange payment of your article-processing charge (APC). You will shortly receive an email with more information.

Checking the proofs

Prior to publication, our production team will also check the format of your manuscript to ensure that it conforms to the standards of the journal. They will be in touch shortly to request any necessary changes, or to confirm that none are needed.

Once we've prepared your paper for publication, you will receive a proof. At this stage, please check that the author list and affiliations are correct. For the main text, only errors that have been introduced during the production process, or those that directly compromise the scientific integrity of the paper, may be corrected.

Please make sure that only one author communicates with us and that only one set of corrections is returned. As the corresponding (or nominated) author, you are responsible for the accuracy of all content, including spelling of names and current affiliations.

To ensure prompt publication, your proofs should be returned within two working days.

Publication is typically within two weeks of the proofs being returned. Please note there will be no further correspondence about your publication date. When your article is published, you will receive a notification email. If you are planning a press release, contact scirep.production@springernature.com when you receive the proofs to arrange a specific publication date.

Publication policies

Acceptance of your manuscript is conditional on all authors agreeing to our publication policies at: <https://www.nature.com/srep/journal-policies/editorial-policies>.

Your article will be open for online commenting on the Scientific Reports website. Please use the report facility if you see any inappropriate comments, and of course, you can contribute to discussions yourself. If you wish to track comments on your article, please register by visiting the 'Comments' section in the full text (HTML) version of your paper.

A form to order reprints of your article is available at <https://www.nature.com/reprints/author-reprints.html>. To obtain the special author reprint rate, orders must be made within a month of the publication date. After that, reprints are charged at the normal (commercial) rate.

Once again, thank you for choosing Scientific Reports, and we look forward to publishing your article.

Kind regards,

Mihaela Delcea
Editorial Board Member
Scientific Reports

P.S. If appropriate, you may also consider uploading any protocols used in this manuscript to the protocol exchange, part of our online web resource, <https://protocolexchange.researchsquare.com>. By participating, you are enabling researchers to reproduce or adapt your methodology. The protocol exchange is fully searchable, providing your protocols and paper with increased utility and visibility. Protocols can also be easily updated via versioning. Please submit your protocol to <https://protocolexchange.researchsquare.com/submission>. You may need to create a new Research Square account. Please provide details of this article in the associated publications section. You'll find more information at: <https://protocolexchange.researchsquare.com>

** Visit the Springer Nature Editorial and Publishing website at www.springemature.com/editorial-and-publishing-jobs for more information about our career opportunities. If you have any questions, please email Editorial.Publishing.Jobs@springemature.com. **

elida zairina <elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id>
To: Dewi Atmaja <dewi.s.atmaja@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 25, 2022 at 6:34 PM

Congrats!!!

Best Wishes,
Elida Zairina, MPH, PhD, Apt
Dept of Pharmacy Practice
Faculty of Pharmacy,
Universitas Airlangga,
Surabaya, 60286, East Java, INDONESIA
email: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id

Begin forwarded message:

From: Scientific Reports <srep@nature.com>
Date: 25 July 2022 at 6:22:27 pm GMT+7
To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id
Subject: Scientific Reports: Decision on your manuscript

Ref: Submission ID 96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2
[Quoted text hidden]

Proofs for your article in Scientific Reports (17410)

1 message

eproofing@springernature.com <eproofing@springernature.com>
Reply-To: SREP_proofcorrections@springernature.com
To: elida-z@ff.unair.ac.id
Cc: scirep.production.pr@springernature.com, anchellet@straive.com

Thu, Jul 28, 2022 at 12:31 AM

SPRINGER NATURE

Article Title : Detection tools for prediction and identification of adverse drug reactions in older patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

DOI : 10.1038/s41598-022-17410-w
96731955-9d30-4781-a3fd-3ea6490a45a2

Dear Author,

We are pleased to inform you that your paper is nearing publication. You can help us facilitate quick and accurate publication by using our e.Proofing system. The system will show you an HTML version of the article that you can correct online. In addition, you can view/download a PDF version for your reference.

As you are reviewing the proofs, please keep in mind the following:

- This is the only set of proofs you will see prior to publication.
- Only errors introduced during production process or that directly compromise the scientific integrity of the paper may be corrected.
- Any changes that contradict journal style will not be made.
- Any changes to scientific content (including figures) will require editorial review and approval.

Please check the author/editor names very carefully to ensure correct spelling, correct sequence of given and family names and that the given and family names have been correctly designated (NB the family name is highlighted in blue).

Please submit your corrections within 2 working days and make sure you fill out your response to any AUTHOR QUERIES raised during typesetting. Without your response to these queries, we will not be able to continue with the processing of your article for Online Publication.

Your article proofs are available at:

https://eproofing.springer.com/ePj/index/n0D5jQ2Hki-6vU4wOJhffMKF9zNkgM6qwKPZe4YmZbVt5DW57Uo2VbE4IWshyC4hI5wA-nTlgs_IrqSI8KTBxXo8GaAEJl1gK-qkjlQdf7wVVGI9rmXgzXOe_p_BMb

The URL is valid only until your paper is published online. It is for proof purposes only and may not be used by third parties.

Should you encounter difficulties with the proofs, please contact me.

We welcome your comments and suggestions. Your feedback helps us to improve the system.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Springer Nature Correction Team

ASV Lotus Business Park
720 & 721 Block 1

Pathari Road, Anna Salai
Chennai, Tamilnadu
India, Pincode 600 002
e-mail: SREP_proofcorrections@springernature.com

SPRINGER NATURE



nature portfolio



SCIENTIFIC
AMERICAN

apress

palgrave
macmillan

