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Reviewer's report:

General

This is a well-conducted systematic review of randomised controlled trials of the effective of EDTA chelation treatment in atherosclerotic disease. The study has revealed a small number of poorly designed trials, with smaller trials shwing benefit, and larger studies indicating no benefit. The main conclusion from the systematic review is the need for a large well-designed study of the effect of EDTA chelation therapy in atherosclerosis, as there is lack of good evidence upon which to base recommendations for this intervention.

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

(1) Page 4, second paragraph from the bottom of the page, 'semi-contentitious' should be 'contentious'.
(2) Abstract indicate that the search was from inception to April 2005, whereas the Methods section indicates an end date of July 2005. Which date is correct?
(3) Under 'Results', 'Main findings', p. 5 first sentence, references to the 14 studies that were initially identified would be helpful to the reader. This also applies to the second sentence - i.e., excluded studies should be clearly referenced.
(4) The abbreviation 'CAM' appears at the end of the first paragraph of Discussion on p. 8 without explanation. Authors must explain the meaning of the abbreviation before using it in the text.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1) Why was mortality not used as an outcome measure by the reviewers?

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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