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General comments: The paper is an important contribution in systematic reviews and in the meta-analysis community which use data from RCTs. The manuscript is well-written.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Table 1 & 2 and Figures 1 & 2 give similar information but the tables also give confidence intervals, so only tables should presented.

2. Page 8, 1st paragraph, 1st sentence: The authors state that "Two additional items that are considered important to be present in RCT publications were also assessed (Table 1)"; were these 'additional items' included in the calculation of OQRS?

3. Page 10, 1st paragraph and Table 4: The response variable KMIS takes on values 0,1,2,3. Could the authors justify the use of Poisson regression instead of polytchotomous logistic regression or logistic regression with the counts (1,2,3) combined.

4. Page 10, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs, and Tables 4 & 5: Could the authors comment on collinearity between the predictor variables in their fitted models.

5. Page 12, 1st paragraph, 6th sentence: The abbreviations KMIS must be defined earlier even though it is defined at the end of the paper.
6. Separate crosstabulations of the response variables (OQRS and KMIS) by the predictor variables would provide useful information on the 23 trials included in the study.

7. Could the tables be included in the text but not given as separate files.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Could the authors comment on the importance of year of publication of the result of the RCTs given that the OQRS is based on the CONSORT statement of 2010.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. The sample size of 23 trials it too small for the results to be generalizable.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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