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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved.

My suggestions for minor essential revisions are:

1. p. 5: "mega-trials" and systematic reviews [7], but no studies appear to have examined a more representative sample of reviews - ought to become: 'mega-trials' and meta-analyses [7], but no studies appear to have examined a more representative sample of systematic reviews.

2. p.5: aimed to compare its results to that of the meta-analyses. - ought to become: aimed to compare its results to that of the meta-analyses of the main outcome measure in the systematic review.

3. p.10: that would change the clinical decision). - ought to become: that would change the clinical decision) and adequately conducted.

4. p. 10: and error check - ought to become: an error check.

5. p.10 - a reference seems to be missing next to the DOTS case - and DOTS needs to be explained.

6. 'Weighted mean difference' ought to become 'mean difference' throughout in text and figures.

7. Figure 1. "Best Study" ought to become 'Best Trial', which will fit with the figure text and meaning.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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