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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions
1. This study has clear implications to me when reading the paper but the authors need to make them more explicit in order to capitalize on their potential impact. I’d like to see a more explicit link between this methodological development and evidence based health care more generally, a key reason for undertaking systematic reviews within health sciences.

2. Leading on from the previous comment, I think the authors could be more explicit in making recommendations for the bibliographic database industry. This would help make clearer the implications of their findings in practice and might therefore have an indirect on systematic reviewing in the future.

3. Similarly, it is unclear whether authors are recommending the use of small databases or a more focused selection of sources when conducting systematic reviews. Please be more explicit in recommendations for future systematic reviewers.

Minor issues not for publication
Abstract: peoples’ – people’s
Background heading – same typo as above
Page 5: in this country – be specific, I assume by this the authors mean the UK as the reference was to DH
Page 7: over third of studies – over a third of studies
UK/US spelling of rigour/rigor – need to be consistent

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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