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Reviewer's report:

General

I find the audience for this work to be quite narrow and the validity of the approach limited.

The objectives of the paper are clearer in this version. The impetus for this paper is a result of a larger effort at methodological assessment of systematic reviews on adverse effects, and highlights at least one type of user of the search efforts outlined in the paper; this indicates the limited scope of audience for this manuscript. The authors have answered regarding generation of the search terms with limited information (see below).

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

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

Consider describing briefly how the search terms were empirically derived from the papers the authors cite in response to our concerns and cite these papers in the manuscript

The tendency of your strategy to retrieve harm related to drugs should be referred to in the discussion.

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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