

## Peer review file

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-20-2290>

**Comment 1:** “The authors entitle this a “meta-analysis” but it seems that they are adopting a systematic review and meta-analysis methodology, by registering with PROSPERO. Why is systematic review not in the title?”.

**Reply 1:** Thanks for your careful reading of our manuscript. We have modified the title into “Dexamethasone and a 5-HT<sub>3</sub> receptor antagonist with or without aprepitant to prevent chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting among lung cancer patients treated with platinum-based chemotherapy: A systematic review and meta-analysis” according to your comment in the revision. We apologize for ignoring this issue in the preliminary submission (see Page 1, line 3).

**Changes in the text:** We have added the “systematic review” to the title and it has been marked in red.

**Comment 2:** “The authors write that a search was “performed on July 30, 2020”. This is insufficient – the authors need to report the last date included in the search for each database (i.e. for Embase, Week X)”.

**Reply 2:** This is a very professional comment. The date July 30, 2020 was not the time to start the search. What we wanted to express was that our search was from inception to July 30, 2020, and we have corrected this sentence into “Our search was from inception to July 30, 2020”. Meanwhile, we are very sorry for the inaccuracy in the paper (see Page 4, line 75-76).

**Changes in the text:** The mistake has been corrected in “Search strategy” part and it also has been marked in red.

**Comment 3:** “The selection criteria is not very clear. This seems to be a definition of the research question by PICOS. Did you mean to say - an article was included if they reported on all parameters of population, intervention, outcome and study design relevant to our PICOS research question?”.

**Reply 3:** This is a very professional and important comment. Your understanding of the inclusion criteria is right, what we meant was that an article was included when it reported all the parameters of population, intervention, results, and research design related to the PICOS research question. In other words, the included articles must meet the following conditions (PICOS): (1)Population (P): patients who have been diagnosed with lung cancer and treated with platinum-based chemotherapy were guided by the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; (2)Intervention (I) and comparison (C): ADH versus DH; (3)Outcomes (O): CR, NNR, RAT, AEs and FLIE score; (4)Study design (S): RCTs. We are very sorry for the misunderstanding, and apologize for not making any changes to the paper according to this professional comment (see Page 4, line 81-87).

**Changes in the text:** Apologize again for not making any changes to the paper.

**Comment 4:** “The authors write that they “ruled out reviews without raw data” at selection criteria. How was this determined? At title and abstract screening? At full-text screening? After contacting corresponding authors and receiving no response?”.

**Reply 4:** We are very appreciative of the helpful comment. We ruled out reviews without raw data by screening the full-text. In order to avoid misunderstanding, we have added an explanation later with “conducted by screening the full text”. This is our negligence, and we apologize for it (see Page 4, line 86).

**Changes in the text:** We have added “conducted by screening the full text” next to the “ruled out reviews without raw data”, which is also marked in red.

**Comment 5:** “How many people undertook the screening to assess for inclusion criteria?”.

**Reply 5:** This is a very professional and important comment. We have two researchers conducted separate searches on databases and manual searches, in duplicate, to search for all relevant research documents published between January 1990 and July 2020. After screening, four studies containing 518 patients were included in our final analysis. We apologize for being negligent by not mentioning this and have added the description to the “search strategy” part (see Page 4, line 74-75).

**Changes in the text:** We have added the description to the “search strategy” part and marked it in red.

**Comment 6:** “The authors write that “the following data were collected and summarized separately by two researchers” – which researchers? Initials please”.

**Reply 6:** Thanks for your precious advice. We have added the initials of the researchers next to the sentence, the whole sentence is “The following data were collected and summarized separately by two researchers (MYH and RXX)” now. Sorry for our negligence (see Page 4-5, line 90-91”).

**Changes in the text:** The initials of the researchers have been added next to the sentence “the following data were collected and summarized separately by two researchers”, it has also been marked in red.

**Comment 7:** “Likewise, please note initials for another researcher that resolved discrepancies. And, how were discrepancies resolved? After discussion with both reviewers and via consensus, or just a separate overruling decision by the third reviewer?”.

**Reply 7:** Thanks for your careful reading of our manuscript. We have replaced “Another researcher resolved discrepancies between the reviewers” with “A third reviewer resolved all the discrepancies (ZWX)”. If the results of the two researchers were different, then the third researcher would conduct separate literature screening, data extraction again according to the discrepancies, and the results of the third researcher shall prevail (see Page 5, line 93-94).

**Changes in the text:** We have replaced “Another researcher resolved discrepancies

between the reviewers” with “A third reviewer resolved all the discrepancies (ZWX)” in the “data extraction” part, and marked it in red.

**Comment 8:** “The model for pooling variances is not specified in the methods section - I believe from the plots it is Mantel-Haenszel? Please specify in the methods section”.

**Reply 8:** Thank you for your careful reading of our manuscript. We apologize for this stupid mistake. We have specified the methods with “Mantel-Haenszel (MH) was used for pooling variances (1)” in the “statistical analysis” part (see Page 6, line 122).

**Changes in the text:** We have added the methods with “Mantel-Haenszel (MH) was used for pooling variances” in the “statistical analysis” part and marked it in red.

**References:**

[1] Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343:d5928.

Special thanks to you again for your careful reading of our manuscript and professional comments.