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Reviewer’s report:

1# In the “method” section, the authors did not explain why they chose only five journals and two years. If they could give clear descriptions of the reasons, that must be more scientific in the study design.

2# In the “method” section, the authors did not state “the process for selecting studies and its relevant details (including who, why, how)”. This process can tell readers and users how this study was conducted and whether biases were produced in the process. So if this process was stated clearly, it will be much better.

3# In the section “Assessment of quality of reports”, the authors said “based our analysis on some of the important checklist items recommended in the revised CONSORT Statement (2001) to evaluate the quality of RCT reporting”. But the authors did not list those important checklist items, and stated the reasons why the chose. In the last paragraph, the authors listed some items, where the authors did not distinguish the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of interventions from CONSORT statement. But CONSORT statement also mentioned these items. So these must be corrected by the author.

4# In the “method” section, the authors did not state the method of statistical analysis, but the authors mentioned results of statistical analysis in the “result” section. So the method of statistical analysis needed to be added by the authors.

5# In the “result” section, the authors just described the process of selecting studies in 2008 and provided a flow chart. But why did not give a figure to describe the process of selecting studies in 1998? It is necessary to present such a figure.

6# In the “Reporting of methodology in 2008 according the different strata” section, the author compared the reporting quality of different factors. This is an innovation of such a study. And it would be better to conduct such an analysis for the studies in 1998 and compare the differences between 1998 and 2008 focusing on each factor?

7# There were also some languages mistakes in their article, so it is better to ask a native English speaker to help revise this paper.

8# Overall, even though there were many mistakes in this paper, but it has its own innovation. And the mistakes could be corrected by careful consideration.
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