

Accepted Manuscript

Reply

Ambuj Kumar, Joel Richter



PII: S0016-5085(18)34867-4
DOI: [10.1053/j.gastro.2018.08.010](https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2018.08.010)
Reference: YGAST 62035

To appear in: *Gastroenterology*

Please cite this article as: Kumar A, Richter J, Reply, *Gastroenterology* (2018), doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.08.010.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

<AT>Reply

<AU>Ambuj Kumar

<AFN>Department of Medicine

University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine

Tampa, Florida

<AU>Joel Richter

<AFN>Department of Digestive Diseases and Nutrition

Joy McCann Culverhouse Center for Swallowing Disorders

University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine

Tampa, Florida

<ARTFN>**Conflicts of interest** The authors disclose no conflicts.

<BEGIN ARTICLE>

Reply. We thank Dayyeh et al for their interest in our systematic review and network meta-analysis (NMA) assessing the efficacy of laparoscopic Nissen fundoplication versus transoral incisionless fundoplication (TIF) or proton pump inhibitors in patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease.¹ The overall message derived from the letter is concerns related to the choice of outcomes in the NMA, interpretation of findings and limitations of NMA. As an example, Dayyeh et al state that the “choice of primary outcomes was arbitrary and differed from the primary outcomes many of the included trials evaluated.” This is one of the most unscientific comments we have heard in the context of the systematic review. We fail to understand, how the authors of this letter came to this arbitrary conclusion? The choice of outcomes in a primary study or a systematic review lies with the investigators and the NMA was performed as per the a priori developed protocol which is also mentioned in the article.¹

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8957718>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8957718>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)