Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Re: 10

We have examined Embase unique trials in a cohort of Cochrane reviews with similar inclusion criteria and found such trials to be fairly uncommon.[6]

This revision doesn't adequately reflect the findings of the authors previous study. Though uncommon the authors own data suggest that there is a risk of bias by omitting embase-unique trials.

"On average, Embase-unique trials yielded significantly smaller estimates by 29% (ratio of odds ratio [ROR] 0.71, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.56-0.90) but influenced the pooled estimate by an average of only 6% (ROR 0.94, 95% CI 0.88-0.99)."
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