Reviewer’s report

Title: The quality of reporting of RCTs used within a postoperative pain management meta-analysis, using the CONSORT statement

Version: 1 Date: 10 March 2012

Reviewer: Mehmet Fatih Can

Reviewer’s report:

Based on data obtained from 23 Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) that were included in an anesthesia related meta-analysis, this manuscript analyzes the quality of reporting of RCT items that are recommended by the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials CONSORT Statement published in 2010. The authors conclude that the overall quality of reporting of RCTs was moderate to poor.

My thoughts, comments and suggestions are listed below:

Generally speaking, this is a well-designed study. The majority of the results obtained was given in an understandable manner and have scientific merit. The ‘discussion’ section dealt with most of the issues that need to be covered. I have a few minor issues that I would like the authors to address:

As the authors mentioned their limitations section, the major weakness of this study is small sample size. It would be good to be able to generalize the findings the authors have, at least for the anesthesia field, so that community and other journals can derive more substantial benefit. The small sample size also appears to have prevented them from achieving some statistically significant results with regard to the factors associated with high quality of reporting. Nevertheless, given the nature and objective of the study, we can say that it properly achieves its purposes.

High journal impact factor has been associated with improvement in the quality of reporting of RCTs by many articles. The below are two examples: BMJ 2011 Sep 26;343:d5886; J Clin Oncol 2011 Mar 20;29(9):1204-9. I suggest that this topic be discussed more widely in the discussion section.

The 2010 version of CONSORT statement includes the “Trial Registry” as one of the items suggested to improve quality. I do not know if there was any reason for not investigating the trial registry as a quality measure in this study. The authors can easily add the survey of trial registry name and number by taking a look at the RCTs as no inter-rater disagreement is anticipated for this specific item.

The typing error of “Randomized Control Trial” should be corrected as “Randomized Clinical Trial” or “Randomized Controlled Trial”.

The number of RCTs reporting “blinding” as a key item is 5 in Table 3 and 6 in
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